



# LIBRARY

Brigham Young University

FROM \_\_\_\_\_

Call \_\_\_\_\_  
No. \_\_\_\_\_

Acc. 177977

No. \_\_\_\_\_

W JC  
39-14233

2-13-53

Lally





SOCIAL FORCES  
in  
PERSONALITY-STUNTING



739  
K12

U

# SOCIAL FORCES

IN

# PERSONALITY STUNTING

BY

*erman*  
ARNOLD H. KAMIAT



177977

SCI-ART PUBLISHERS

HARVARD SQUARE

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

B.V.U.  
LIBRARY  
PROV. UTAH



COPYRIGHT 1939

ARNOLD H. KAMIAT

Printed by Independent Press, Boston  
U. S. A.

U. S. A.  
KAMIAT  
HALL, OGDEN



TO  
LEA ESTERMAN  
MY WIFE



# CONTENTS

---

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Preface . . . . .	11
I. Interpretations of Society's Ills . .	17
Rationalistic Interpretations of Society's Failure — History as a Learning Process — Mystic Interpretations — Inadequate Solutions — The Concept of Immaturity in Other Writings.	
II. The Psychological Immaturity of Men and Women . . . . .	26
III. Immaturity, Paranoia and Para- noidism . . . . .	31
Collective Paranoia — Collective Paranoia of Ruling Groups — The Price of Com- petition.	
IV. Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity . . . . .	41
Intolerance as Rooted in Fear — The Fear of Doubt — The Autocracy of the Intoler- ant — Sex Intolerance — Conflict of Al- truistic and Egoistic Impulses.	
V. The Two Levels of Human Life .	56
Conjugal and Parental Love among the Immature — Ill Health and Immaturity.	

# Contents

Chapter		Page
VI.	The Inferiority of Ruling Groups . . . . .	63
	The Underworld Aristocracy — Ruling Groups Not Morally Superior — Ruling Groups Not Intellectually Superior — Ruling Groups Not Volitionally Superior — A Dangerous Deception.	
VII.	Power, Real and Illusory . . . . .	74
	Maximal Power is Cultural.	
VIII.	The Republic of Culture . . . . .	80
IX.	A Qualification . . . . .	83
X.	An Interpretation of History . . . . .	86
	The Real Function of Social Institutions — The Rational and Altruistic Myth — The Etiquette Assumption — Illustrations of Romantic Historiography — False Psychological Notions — Mystic Historiography — Pareto's Fallacy — Sociological Relations — Schools of Thought and Levels of Life — A New Criterion of Greatness.	
XI.	Slaves and Dictators . . . . .	120
	A Note on Plato and Fichte.	
XII.	Sex Patriotism . . . . .	123
	The Roots of Androcracy and Gynocracy — The Attitude of the Sexes to Each Other — The Cosmic Phantasy — The Sex-Patriot's Dream World — Masculine Totalitarianism.	
XIII.	Masculinist Delusions . . . . .	139
	Masculinist Mummery — Domestic Autocracy — Androcratic Sophistry — The Family as a Bulwark of Autocracy.	
XIV.	A Program . . . . .	153
	Is it a Question of Changing Human Nature — Sacred Institutions — A General Program — An Experiment with Democracy and Dictatorship.	



## *Contents*

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
XV. Shall Intelligence Be Brought to Bear on Social Problems? . . .	167
Practice versus Theory Not the Issue — A Comment on Laski — The Superiority of Scientific Method — The Average Man's Opposition to Social Science — Knowledge by Instinct? — Knowledge by Intuition? — The Real Average Man — No Dictatorship of the Intellectual — Intelligent Counselors in the Past.	
XVI. Political Instruments for the Media- tion of Intelligence . . .	194
Scientific Advisory Boards for Govern- ments — In Case the Scientists Disagree — Social Experimentation — A New Type of Politician and Political Machinery.	
XVII. The Impracticality of Party Government . . .	203
Melodrama as a Substitute for Reason — Factions — Dictatorship Not the Solution.	
XVIII. One Thing the Individual Might Do	212
The Danger of Group Emotion — The Transference of Faith.	
Appendix — Male Masochism and Culture .	219
The Masochistic Ideal — Masochism in Religion — Masochistic Myths — Maso- chism in Art — Masochism in Literature — Social Masochism — Masochistic Myths of Today.	
Indexes . . .	247



## PREFACE

THIS book seeks to direct attention to a tremendously important, albeit long neglected, fact,— at least I think it is a fact, — and one without which an adequate comprehension of the ills of both the individual and society is impossible. The consideration of this fact yields a new criterion of social values and justifies a severe indictment of past and present forms of social organization.

The thesis, stated briefly, is this. Most of the physical adults of all races and nations of which history has any record, have been psychologically, that is, intellectually, emotionally and volitionally immature. So has also been the greater number of their leaders in industry, politics, military affairs and the church. To what is this due? The cause lies in this, that human society has always been essentially exploitative, autocratic and competitive in structure and spirit. Men have sought to grow at the expense of each other. Wherever this is the case, it issues in arrested and imperfectly integrated personalities. Nor is this unfortunate result confined to the victims of exploitation: the exploiters, the autocrats, the victors in the conflict, oftener than not, exhibit the traits of psychological immaturity. What has hitherto passed for nobility and

## *Preface*

aristocracy has therefore been pseudo-nobility and pseudo-aristocracy, dressed up to dissemble superiority. The argument that the tragic struggle for existence is biologically necessary is thus disposed of.

The predominant activities on the exploitative level are industrial, political and military. The values most sought for are economic wealth and power over others. The latter is to a large extent illusory, for in the exigencies of competition social institutions become, in part, devices by means of which every one strives to restrict the range of influence of everybody else.

A striking feature of life on this level is the paranoid mentality, not only of many average men and women, but of a great number of public figures as well. This trait becomes accentuated by membership in militant movements, themselves instruments for the acquisition of power. The psychology of such movements exhibits a point by point correspondence to that of paranoia; the resemblance is close enough to warrant the use of the phrase, collective paranoia. One expression of this malady is intolerance of dissentient opinion.

There seem to be only two levels on which human society can subsist. One of these is the prepotently exploitative, autocratic and competitive, just described. The other is primarily demo-



## *Preface*

cratic and co-operative in character. Democracy is defined as a way of life guided by the principle that the growth of the personality requires — and in its turn fosters — that of other personalities.

The chief activities of a society making practical application of this principle would be cultural. By culture is meant the creation and appreciation of artistic, scientific, philosophical and ethical values. The ethical embraces all behavior conducive to the fullest maturation of human beings. A psychologically mature person is one whose approach to problems is rational and objective, whose dominant affects are sympathetic and benign, and who is able to socialize his impulses. Economic and political, and ecclesiastical affairs, if any, would be assimilated to the ethical, and therefore the cultural.

The closest approximations to this kind of society are furnished by the realms of art, science, philosophy and ethical living. Allowing for the presence of a large admixture of psychological immaturity among the inhabitants of these worlds, it is correct to state that it is there that a maximal degree of co-operation and democracy is attained. There human energies are liberated, and the exercise of power at any given point frees and augments its enjoyment at other points. It is in the republic of culture that genuine aristocracy is located.

## *Preface*

The definition of the rôle played by psychological immaturity issues in a radical re-interpretation of history. The latter is seen to be something other than the record of practical and realistic men and women, guided by far-sighted, social-minded and well-meaning leaders, to live the good life as best as they knew how. This picture is largely mythical. Other suppositions still entertained by historians, philosophers and social scientists are revealed to be idyllic notions.

The thesis of this book does not pretend to be either exclusive or exhaustive. It is not suggested that everything in history is explicable in terms of the immaturity hypothesis. Further, the standpoint outlined in this book may be used to supplement other possible social interpretations and critiques.

A program of action is offered, but no panacea. The establishment of conditions favorable to complete personality-development is to be achieved, if at all, by attacking the problem at all points along a wide front, using everything that all the sciences and accumulated human experience have to give. One of the things insisted upon, however, is the democratization of every department of life in society.

We appear to be living in a period when the centuries-old malady of a society subsisting on the

## *Preface*

level of exploitation is coming to a head. The world is caught in a maelstrom of collective paranoias, and the clash of power-craving groups menaces the delicate fabric of civilization. The most depressing aspect of the situation is not the presence of so many grave problems, but the apparent insufficiency of psychological maturity in contemporary men, women and their leaders.

It is the fashion to say that humanity has not kept up with the progress of science and technology. Morals have not kept pace with mechanical invention. In terms of my thesis the case may be stated thus: toward the problems involved in the conquest of nature, in the narrow sense of the term, we have learned to react in a mature way. As regards the problems of individual growth and social living, however, we persist in clinging to immature reaction-patterns.

Never was there greater need for full-grown men and women than today. Never was it more urgent to provide human beings with the means and the stimuli of maturation.

I wish to take the opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness to Dr. A. A. Roback for many suggested improvements in the manuscript.

*"Unexhausted and undiscovered still  
are man and man's world."*

NIETZSCHE  
(Thus Spake Zarathustra)



## CHAPTER I

### INTERPRETATIONS OF SOCIETY'S ILLS

THE value of a goodly proportion of what has been said and written is considerably diminished by the idyllic assumption that underlies practically all discourse on life and the problems thereof. This is the assumption that, as a general thing, the physically mature men and women of the past and present have been and are intellectually, emotionally, and volitionally mature.

It has always been believed that human beings, as a matter of course, mature "naturally", and that this process can and does occur under any social system. Psychological maturation — the maturation of intellect, will and emotion — has been supposed to be intrinsic to the mind. In other words, the mind just grows as does the body, and it persists in its growth until the hereditarily determined limit has been attained. In fine, it has always been assumed that, excepting pathological and defective cases, all human adults are completely adult. Historians, philosophers, novelists, dramatists, social

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

scientists, most psychologists and ordinary men and women, whenever they have discoursed on human life and human beings and their problems, have simply taken for granted the psychological adulthood of physically mature men and women.

Given this romantic assumption, an adequate explanation of the ills that beset man and society is simply out of the question. Not only that, but it is the fact that they started out with this assumption that accounts for the bewilderment which thinkers have often experienced as they surveyed mankind in all its history. When they asked how man could be so base, they have had a psychologically mature man in mind. Having assumed at the outset that man has been present with all his parts when he was present at all, they have found it rather difficult to explain his failures and his miseries.

### RATIONALISTIC INTERPRETATIONS OF SOCIETY'S FAILURE

Nor has it occurred to them to question their idyllic premise. Instead, they have continued to take its truth for granted, and as a consequence they have had to resort to all kinds of dubious expedients to explain how man comes continuously

## *Interpretations of Society's Ills*

to keep the world a shambles. Generally they have had recourse to either a rationalistic or a mystic interpretation. The rationalistic explanation has it that the evils which have plagued humanity are due to ignorance. "Man is the only animal that does not know how to live." Humanity is full of good intentions, but it knows not how to fulfill them. People are good, they mean well, but they do what they do because they do not know any better. They do their best, even if their best is not good enough. They are not disposed to evil; they are merely ignorant.

A variant on the same theme has it that the troubles from which humanity has suffered are traceable to the institutions under which it has lived. Human behavior is a response to social situations, and the latter are largely what the mores, the laws, the traditions, and the economic, political, and ecclesiastical structures of a society make them. Human behavior and human nature at any given place and time are functions of the structure of a given society at a given point in its history. This is a mechanistic view, but it takes on a rationalistic form when it asserts that the persistence of inefficient or destructive social institutions is attributable to human ignorance of their true character.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### HISTORY AS A LEARNING PROCESS

According to the rationalistic interpretation of history, then, humanity and its leaders have been the victims of ignorance. The truths men must know in order to live well cannot be learned all at once. It takes centuries of experience and of suffering to acquire them. History is a process of learning, and experience is the teacher.

### MYSTIC INTERPRETATIONS

There have, however, been thinkers who disdained rationalistic explanations and had recourse to those of a mystic kind instead. One very frequent type of mysticism finds expression in the assumption of an intrinsic something or other in human nature. Human beings are intrinsically bad, selfish, egotistic, grasping. An inner something, an urge to life, a will to power, impels them toward competition, toward war, toward supremacy. A profound, instinctive insight into its destiny, its hegemony, propels a race or a nation on toward imperialism and conquest.

These mystic explanations of human behavior are no explanations at all. They supply words, not causes. Intrinsic evil, urge to life, will to

## *Interpretations of Society's Ills*

power, preordained hegemony and similar phrases are not explanations, but verbal substitutes therefor. It is mere tautology to assert that people do wrong because human nature is wicked, or that they crave supremacy because of a will to power, or that an urge to life impels one to compete for a chance to live.

At any rate, this type of explanation, proceeding as it does on the assumption that it has to deal with fully-grown men and women, completely misconceives the character of human error. This will become clear as the argument proceeds.

Under the head of the mystic explanation belong also certain religious answers to the problem of evil. These usually assign to evil a definite rôle in the salvation of man or the realization of some divine purpose. Or evil may be held to be the manifestation of a malign cosmic spirit, perpetually at war with the benign ruler of the universe and fated to be conquered by him. A certain philosophical view has it that evil is an essential ingredient in the total experience of a cosmic absolute. The most pessimistic conception identifies evil with existence itself.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### INADEQUATE SOLUTIONS

It is needless to add that the solutions proposed have been as inadequate as the explanations from which they were derived. Taking for granted, as they have, the intellectual, emotional and volitional maturity of nearly all men and women, they could hardly be expected to provide facilities for the psychological maturation of human beings. Many of the attempts that men and women have made toward the improvement of their lot in this world have undoubtedly been a factor in whatever psychological growth they have enjoyed. Wherever this happened, however, it has been incidental to the achievement of some other purpose: it has never been set up as a valuable end in itself. Many attempts at the improvement of human existence have failed precisely because their success required psychologically mature citizens as an initial fact.

It is when one turns to the mystics and the pessimists that one learns what damage the naïve assumption can do. Envisaging the men and women of the past and present as psychologically adult, and impressed by the amount of evil that nevertheless fills the world, they have little hope for that world. They therefore counsel resignation, and perhaps also preparation for a better life

## *Interpretations of Society's Ills*

in another world, or the dissolution of being in Nirvana. Or perhaps they recommend an escape into art.

Any proposal for the improvement of man's lot which requires existent psychologically mature men and women as an initial condition for its successful consummation is obviously self-defeating. It is like the suggestion George Bernard Shaw brought forward in his *Man and Superman*. In this book Shaw is dissatisfied with humanity because it lacks the will to progress. He wants a eugenic program that will breed men and women possessed of the will to progress. But, alas, his program requires the will to progress as an initial condition! This has been the trouble with the centuries-old hortatory programs of the churches. They have for thousands of years been exhorting the volitionally and emotionally immature faithful to love one another and to exhibit strength of will. For thousands of years governments have exhorted psychologically immature citizens to exhibit civic maturity, and with negligible results. And far too many of the proposals of reformers, prophets, crusaders and revolutionists have fallen to the ground for a reason exactly similar.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### THE CONCEPT OF IMMATURITY IN OTHER WRITINGS

The idea of the psychological immaturity of some physical adults has occurred to some. Bertrand Russell somewhere describes war and international politics as children's games played by children. A. Curtis Wilgus, in his book, *South American Dictators*, says: "Dictators are much like small boys who have never grown up." Psychoanalysts make frequent references to what they term infantile behavior. The phrase usually has a strictly sexual connotation, however. It is at times used to mean a tendency to revel too much in day-dreams, as well as an habitual employment of tantrums or neurotic illnesses as devices for winning a dominant position over others. However, I do not recall any psychoanalyst ever classifying the majority of the physical adults of past and present societies as immature. Theodore Schroeder, a writer of the psychoanalyst school, whose literary output is quite substantial, and who ought to be better known than he is, has, in numerous books and articles, laid considerable stress on the immature attitude toward sexuality exhibited by the overwhelming majority of adults in past and present societies. Nor has he neglected to portray the

## *Interpretations of Society's Ills*

psychological immaturity revealed by emotional radicalisms, liberalisms, conservatism and other "isms." He has placed considerable emphasis on the psychological immaturity of those who exhibit an intolerance of views dissenting from theirs. Altogether, he has done more to bring forward the concept of psychological immaturity than any other writer I know of.

In a recently published book by Dr. A. A. Roback, *The Psychology of Common Sense*, the manifestations of immaturity in American life are described in detail in the chapters "The Infantilization of America" and "What Is Sanity?"

## CHAPTER II

### THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMMATURITY OF MEN AND WOMEN

HUMAN societies of the past and present have been composed almost entirely of individuals who, even when physically adult, have been intellectually, emotionally and volitionally immature.

To show that the proposition possesses a rather high degree of probability, one may proceed in several ways.

To begin with, it will surely not be maintained that human beings have as a general thing exhibited a high degree of rationality, or that sympathy and love have been prevalent among them, or that strength of will has been a common phenomenon. It will perhaps be maintained that men and women have developed right up to their hereditarily determined limits, that if they have not grown beyond the points attained, it is because their hereditary equipments precluded further expansion. But this is to argue either that education and social institutions play no rôle whatever as determiners of growth, or that they have been so



## *Psychological Immaturity*

perfectly adjusted to all human needs as to make it highly improper to charge them with the arrest of the growth of human personalities.

Another way of establishing the high probability of the immaturity proposition is this: no society has ever made a conscious effort deliberately to provide its children with an education, and its physical adults with an environment that would facilitate the acquisition of psychological maturity. Nor is this all. In the course of the argument an attempt will be made to show that, as far as we know, every society has tolerated ways of life and social institutions that have functioned to thwart the psychological maturation of human personalities.

There is still another reason for accepting the immaturity hypothesis. Psychologically mature behavior aims at the maximal growth of the personality. The mature person is a grown-up, but he sets no limit to his growth. He sees no reason for the discontinuance of his growth. Now the psychological growth of every human being is dependent upon, and is in turn the necessary condition of the psychological growth of other human beings. This is the democratic principle. The mature person — unless otherwise indicated, the terms *growth*, *mature*, *immature*, *maturity* and

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

similar words will be understood to be qualified by the adjective *psychological* — therefore idealizes that society, those ways of life and those social institutions that make for the fullest and richest growth of all selves, his own included. In Fichte's words, the free man wants a society of free men. The mature person is co-operative and democratic.

The immature individual, on the other hand, proceeds on the assumption that his growth can take place only at the expense of others. His ideal society, ways of life and social institutions are therefore those that express the exploitative, the competitive, the autocratic principle.

Now practically all society, past and present, has in fact been built on this principle more than on any other. This has been at once the cause and the effect, the expression and the perpetuating factor of the psychological immaturity of most of mankind, past and present.

Men and women have almost always persisted in the perpetuation of exploitative, competitive and autocratic ways of life and social systems, and this in spite of the frightful mass of evils that has issued from them. They have, as a rule, meekly and uncritically accepted the institutions they were born into, and the evils that have gone with them,

*Psychological Immaturity*

as an unavoidable component of life. They have even accepted, in a spirit equally meek and uncritical, the notion that the ways and institutions in question rightfully are and should be a component, and an eternal component, of life. And whenever the few men and women of vision — scientists, prophets, artists, philosophers — have proposed the substitution of other ways of life, other forms of social organization, the great mass of men and women has not only declined to examine their proposals, but has even reacted to them in anger and violence; it has even put their advocates to death. This is what I should consider evidence of the psychological immaturity of the vast majority, past and present, of mankind. Such behavior is proof that human beings have not yet grown to a point where they realize the need for an ascent to higher levels of behavior. It is one of the ironies of human existence that it requires a certain degree of maturity for a person to want to mature. Only the mature know that they will always need to grow.

The exploitative character of practically all human society is at once proof and explanation of the psychological immaturity of most of the members of the human race. As has already been pointed out, only the psychologically immature

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

can tolerate an exploitative order. The psychologically mature person wishes neither to be an object of exploitation, nor to live in a world made up of the immature and the stunted. And for this reason he does not wish to exploit others: he knows that he would thereby deprive himself of the necessary condition of his own growth. But the universal existence of exploitative societies furnishes an explanation of pandemic psychological immaturity. For what other kind of human being but a psychologically immature one could an exploitative social system be expected to produce? Exploitation involves the attempt to grow at others' expense. Exploitation is spiritual anthropophagy. Even if exploitation does nothing more than deprive its victims of the minimum amount of material goods necessary for the satisfaction of elementary physical needs, it already makes maturation difficult or impossible. Ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-sheltered creatures do not as a rule acquire the full stature of men and women. But exploitation does more than rob its subjects of the economic bases of growth. Exploitation does certain things to the exploited and the *exploiter as well*. What these things are and what form psychological immaturity takes will become apparent as the argument proceeds.

## CHAPTER III

### IMMATURITY, PARANOIA AND PARANOIDISM

EUGEN BLEULER finds the essence of paranoia in a delusional system—delusions of self-reference, grandeur and persecution—and an imperviousness to all criticism directed at them. D. K. Henderson and R. D. Gillespie detect in the disease ideas of reference and persecution and a sense of superiority with grandiose delusions. H. L. Hollingworth stresses the systematized delusions of the expansive or persecutory type, marked by self-reference.

Paranoia is, then, egotism developed to an extreme and pathological degree. Not only in paranoia, but in other psychoses, and in any neurosis as well, one is likely to find the exploitative, the competitive and the autocratic impulses developed to pathological extremes. Hence Adler's insistence on the neurosis as an over-compensation for feelings of inferiority. Eugen Bleuler is authority for the statement that psychotics are prone to violence. Barring mental defectives, psychotics possess the least psychological maturity of any adults.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

In that form of psychosis known as paranoia, the egotistic impulses enjoy a development so rich as to justify the designations of egomania and megalomania.

The paranoiac has delusions of grandeur. He carries delusions of personal superiority, intellectual superiority, infallibility, moral superiority, and often one of superiority in the art of government. His life is an attempt to act out, to live his magnificent dream-picture of himself.

The paranoiac's ambitions very often lie in the direction of power. He wishes to exert influence; he has an insensate craving for leadership. However, he sees in every person a force directed against him. He suspects everyone of striving to block him, to exercise power over him. Hence his mistrust, fear and hatred of others. Wary and hypersensitive, he misinterprets the acts and statements of all those around him. Everything becomes part of a conspiracy against him. Often he hits back at the "conspirators," sometimes with physical violence, even homicide.

The paranoiac has a delusion of infallibility. It is a sign of intellectual immaturity to prefer beliefs and creeds to knowledge. The paranoiac has his beliefs. Concerning them he feels intensely. He invests these with an intense sense of certitude.

He mistakes this sense of certitude for proof of the truth of his beliefs. To him can be applied a phrase which occurs in the writings of Theodore Schroeder: "He is firmly convinced because strongly agitated."

The paranoiac identifies his beliefs with truth. All dissentient beliefs he labels error. The line of demarcation between truth and error always happens to coincide with that between his beliefs and all opposing ones. An active propagandist, he often disseminates his doctrines with a ferocity that is usually mistaken for sincerity and zeal. Interested more in power than in truth, and seeing in all dissident beliefs a limitation of his own influence, he is fiercely intolerant. He takes all criticism personally. Any criticism of his beliefs, any suggestion that his opinions may be erroneous, is construed as an impugning of his wisdom, sanity, intelligence and right-mindedness, as an attack on his personality. His delusion of infallibility he calls faith in his doctrine, and his megalomania he calls faith in himself.

The paranoiac, seeking to set his personal impress upon the world, though he be engaged in ever so bitter a warfare against it, feels, nonetheless, that he is in a certain sense at one with it. For he is that leader, that savior, that ruler that the world

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

requires and that fate decreed the arrival of. The world indeed exists that he might be — and be its dominant force. This is the paranoiac's cosmic phantasy. The latter is the world viewed subjectively. It is the world conceived as placed there in order to be exploited, dominated, ruled by our hero.

The real world, alas, is not the paranoiac's fantastic one and therefore, in making his way through it, our hero sometimes stumbles. This real world continually interposes obstacles in the path of its predestined leader. The obstacles are often human, composed of people who perversely refuse to accept their leader and ruler. They are misled by their beliefs, which must be erroneous, for they contradict the hero's, which to him are truth itself. They cannot be sincere in their opposition, for the hero's own doctrine is so obviously true, and every dissident doctrine so obviously false, that it is inconceivable that any one could fail to make the right choice. The dissenters, then, are simply malevolent persons, envious of the hero's destiny and greatness, and their opposition is a conspiracy against him.

In brief, the paranoiac finds the presence in this world of anything that does not conform to his standards simply unendurable. There is room

## *Immaturity, Paranoia and Paranoidism*

in the world only for himself and that which he renders like unto himself. The paranoiac is a totalitarian.

### COLLECTIVE PARANOIA

Such is the picture of the paranoiac, that is, the individual paranoiac. There appears to be, however, such a thing as collective paranoia. This is paranoia on a social scale. It is exhibited by what the social psychologist calls crowds. The crowd may be a movement, a party, a class, a ruling group, a nation, a race, a sex, a religious denomination. The individual member of the crowd is not necessarily paranoiac, but however rational he may be toward other issues, with reference to those issues concerning which the crowd takes a militant attitude, it is difficult or impossible for him to adopt a rational one. With reference to these issues, his behavior simulates paranoia to such an extent as to justify terming it paranoid. A crowd is made up of individuals who are paranoid with reference to a given set of issues.

The stigmata of collective paranoia can be detected in any crowd: the delusion of intellectual, moral and political superiority; the monstrous presumption that it has a monopoly of political in-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

telligence and governing ability; the cosmic phantasy of the world as destined to come under the sway of one's group; the delusion of infallibility, evidenced by a fanatical dogmatism and a fierce intolerance; an acute fear of inquiry, criticism and discussion; a ceaseless tendency to discover conspiracies against itself everywhere; a hatred of opposition that sometimes becomes insensate and breaks out in violence; an insistence that all things be patterned to conform to the crowd ideology. Some of these items may be lacking in any given case, others may subsist in moderate degree, but every crowd is sure to exhibit at least a few of these features.

Once the fact of collective paranoia is grasped, an explanation of one of the great paradoxes of crowd behavior becomes possible. It is paradoxical that militant movements which evince such solicitude for social welfare, brotherly love, culture and progress, contribute little to these, and much to the sum-total of barbarism already extant. The paradox need surprise no one. It is essentially the same phenomenon as that exhibited on a small scale by the individual paranoiac. The latter is always a barbarian. He may vaunt some sort of an idealism; he may put himself forward as the lover of his country, his race or all mankind; he may



promise a reconstruction of society that would improve the quality of life tenfold: all this is but the articulation of his grandiose delusion of messiahship. The much-talked of and little understood idealism of militant movements is often in part or in whole an expression of the crowd's delusion of grandeur and messianic mission. It is an expression of its love of power. Power, and not social welfare, is what it wants first, last and all the time. Everything that helps gain it power it terms good; everything that thwarts it in its quest it calls evil. And in collective as well as in individual paranoia, opposition becomes an object of insensate hatred and panicky fear; both these affects often break out in violence.

#### COLLECTIVE PARANOIA OF RULING GROUPS

This very important point must now be noted, that every ruling group is a militant crowd. Every such group exhibits a collective paranoia. Let the reader go over the features of the paranoiac syndrome and verify that fact for himself. The members of ruling groups are distinctly paranoid in their approach to all questions that concern their relation to subject and exploited groups. The collective paranoia of ruling groups becomes especially

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

prominent during all social crises in which their dominant position is threatened.

Collective paranoia seems to infect ruling groups of every type. The group may be a class, a caste, a party, a nation, a race, a sex, or just a small clique. No matter which of these it is, it will reveal the stigmata.

Perhaps it will be maintained that at least a ruling groups' estimation of itself as intellectually, morally and volitionally superior is not a delusion. At a later point in the argument it will be shown to be just that.

### THE PRICE OF COMPETITION

Paranoidism and collective paranoia are the price men and women pay for life on an exploitative, competitive and autocratic level. They are the sequelae of the personality-stunting and personality-disintegrating ways of life on the level of psychological immaturity. They come into prominence wherever person strives to live at the expense of person, and group at the expense of group.

Wherever there is exploitation and autocracy, there conflict is rife. And wherever there is struggle between human beings over power and material wealth, there all the pathogenic feelings

## *Immaturity, Paranoia and Paranoidism*

luxuriate: worry, anxiety, fear, hatred, anger, terror. These are mind-arresting and mind-disintegrating forces. They do not of themselves generate paranoia. I do not offer any explanation of the cause of that disease. I do assert that paranoia is a sign of psychological immaturity, and that the latter is the rule on the exploitative level. On this level, men divide themselves into militant crowds. These crowds definitely exhibit collective paranoia with reference to certain issues, and in their attitude toward these issues the individual components of these crowds become distinctly paranoid. Among these crowds, and sharing their psychology, are the ruling groups of every kind.

Practically everyone is a member of one or more crowds. Practically everyone is therefore paranoid in his attitude toward certain issues. This paranoidism, among other things, makes a rational solution of social problems such a difficult affair. The emotionality which men and women have throughout history exhibited in relation to social issues is an expression of this paranoidism and hence of their psychological immaturity.

One further note needs to be added to complete the discussion of the morbidity generated by life on the exploitative, competitive and autocratic level. In the realm of sex rivalry, the rivalry of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

the sexes for power over each other, a complicating factor enters in the shape of sado-masochistic attitudes. Between androcracy and gynarchy on the one hand, and sado-masochistic attitudes on the other, there probably exists a reciprocal reinforcing relationship. In the appendix at the end of this book, I deal with the probable influence of male masochism on history and culture.

## CHAPTER IV

### INTOLERANCE AS AN INDEX OF IMMATURITY

ONE of the most prominent of the stigmata of psychological immaturity is intolerance of dissident opinion. The degree of intolerance a person manifests may furnish a rough index of his relative immaturity. Further, a psychological analysis of intolerance throws a good deal of light on the paranoid character of the immature adult. In the manner in which the immature person greets an idea that differs from his, there may be discovered a clue to the difficulties that beset him.

The nature of intolerance has not been very well understood. It has been so little understood that it has even been surrounded by an aura of romance. Intolerance has been misconceived as a sign of intellectual strength, faith, positive conviction, will power, patriotism and moral ardor, whatever that is. All of which has carried an appeal to almost everyone, for almost everyone is intolerant and likes to think himself intellectually strong, patriotic and morally arduous, full of faith



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

and blessed with will power. Furthermore, those who derive a profit, political or economic, from the suppression of disturbing doctrine, find it good business to keep these misconceptions alive. These derive their main support from the universal idyllic assumption of the psychological maturity of the members of the human race. To understand intolerance, this assumption must be given up and replaced by the assumption of psychological immaturity. Once this is done, intolerance becomes easily explicable in terms of the immature person's paranoid impulses and affects. More specifically, intolerance is to be explained in terms of the immature person's fear, delusion of infallibility and love of power.

### INTOLERANCE AS ROOTED IN FEAR

Intolerance is rooted in fear. The intolerant person fears that his own doctrine may be false, and the doctrine not his own, true. This is simple and obvious, yet people insist on circulating the usual hokum about the intolerant person being impelled by his intense conviction, his great faith. We are all more or less suggestible. We cannot be exposed to ideas not our own without the fear emerging in our minds that the ideas in question

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

may be at least partly true. We cannot then avoid the fear that our own pet ideologies may be at least partly and perhaps fundamentally false.

The intolerant person is afraid. He fears discussion, for discussion may reveal the very thing he fears. So he forbids discussion. He forbids experimentation with the dissident ideas, he proscribes their practical application, for practice and experiment may lead to the dreaded revelation.

One of the things that make for the universality of intolerance is the fact that the overwhelming majority of people do not come by their ideas rationally. They come to them by other routes than reason. They absorb them from their environment — from family, from friends, from teachers, from newspapers, from the pulpit, from books, lectures and speeches, from everybody everywhere. Also, they are attracted to certain doctrines by their pleasing or comforting or flattering character. Again, certain ideas are useful in providing the "justification" for the perpetuation of social institutions which yield a desirable return in the shape of power and material wealth. Further, certain ideas are "accepted" because it is unsafe to deny them — in public.

Now there is a certain distinct disadvantage in arriving at a doctrine via any route other than the

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

rational. The disadvantage is this, that it does not fit one for the task of presenting a respectably rational defense of one's ideas. It does not even render one able rationally to articulate them. The result is to place one at the mercy of any and every rational critic who happens to come along. This, in turn, results in a lack of confidence in face of the dissenter, lack of confidence in one's ability to make out a case for one's doctrine. One is then conscious of the insufficiency of his rational resources. The consequence of all this is fear, fear of dissent, fear of criticism, fear of discussion, fear of rational analysis.

It is to be borne in mind that these fears are well-nigh universal. Because everybody comes by many or most of his notions through some route other than the rational, everyone exhibits to a greater or lesser degree a lack of confidence before dissenters. Almost everyone, when confronted by a dissentient idea, is overcome by a sense of his impotence before it. It is precisely this sense of impotence which generates the anger with which people greet ideas that differ from theirs. Anger is often a symptom of a sense of helplessness.

*Intolerance is then, not a sign of faith, but of lack of faith.*

The intolerant person lacks faith. He lacks

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

faith in his doctrine, in himself, in his ability rationally to defend his belief. Immaturity and self-confidence do not go together.

It is really remarkable that almost no one has ever recognized that the intolerant person is simply one who has failed to grow up. It occurs to very few to ask whether there is not something the matter with the person who esteems his beliefs and opinions as absolutely true, and to whom all dissentient beliefs are absolutely false. Such a person is very obviously under the domination of a delusion of infallibility. Such a person loudly proclaims himself the lover of truth and the opponent of error. But is there not something the matter with people for whom the line of demarcation between truth and error always happens to be the line that divides their ideologies from dissident ones? Are these people anything else but intellectual narcissists, in love with themselves rather than with truth? The immaturity of their outlook is concealed from them by their delusion of infallibility. (For an account of this delusion, see my articles in *Social Science*, August, 1928, November, 1928, February, 1929, May, 1929.)

Love of truth does not exhibit itself as suppression of dissentient doctrine. Nor does the lover of truth perpetually beg the question by as-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

suming the complete erroneousness of every idea not his own. By what conduct, by what sign, may the lover of truth be known? He can be seen at his best in the realms of science and philosophy. These have been in existence long enough to furnish an answer to the question. It is really remarkable that, with scientists and philosophers showing the world what a lover of truth looks like, anybody could ever make the mistake of identifying an intolerant person with a seeker of truth.

The lover of truth is known by his persistent and hospitable examination of ideas *not* his own. Precisely because he wants truth, he seeks it everywhere, even in other minds than his. He is not so egotistic as to assume that his and minds like his are the only minds that can generate or contain truth, and he is therefore never guilty of the gross fallacy that an idea born or contained in minds unlike his must by some dark necessity be false. The lover of truth is indeed intolerant of error, but he does not identify error with dissident doctrine. Such an identification rightly seems to him glib, question-begging and egotistical. He relies upon logical analysis, discussion, scientific observation and experiment and actual practice to separate truth and error. The resort to force to effect such



## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

a separation rightly seems to him a cruel and insane irrelevancy.

If, further, the lover of truth has come by his ideas rationally, he is likely to possess confidence in his ability to make out a rational case for himself. He will have faith in himself, in his ideas, in the rational method, and in the adequacy of his rational resources. He is likely to be reasonably free from fear of dissenters, and therefore from the vindictive impulsion to censor and suppress.

### THE FEAR OF DOUBT

A fairly good index of the relative psychological maturity or immaturity of an individual is furnished by his attitude toward the doubts that arise in his mind. Here it becomes necessary to throw a popular fiction into the discard. This fiction has it that the distinction between the believer and the rational critic is this, that the latter doubts and the former does not. The distinction is false. Both doubt, the believer as well as the critic. Every human being capable of entertaining an idea doubts. One simply cannot help the experience of at least an occasional doubt. But the believer suppresses his doubt, whereas the rational person faces it. And there is the difference be-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

tween psychological immaturity and psychological maturity. To the mature person, an idea is not an end in itself. It is no proper object of worship. It is merely a medium by means of which one endeavors to obtain a picture of, and to exercise some degree of control over, reality. Ideas have a truth-value and pragmatic value. They must be subjected to continued scrutiny, and where they fail to fulfill their functions, they require to be modified or replaced by other ideas. Not so among the psychologically immature. Here intellectual narcissism and the delusion of infallibility require of the believer that he esteem himself the possessor of the absolute truth. Here an idea has a psychological rather than a logical value. It is a symbol of the believer's self-esteem. It would therefore never do for the believer to discover that his ideology could err in the slightest particular. Hence the phobia directed against doubt. Hence the desperate and persistent suppression of the believer's own doubts.

However, a suppressed doubt is not necessarily an inactive one. The doubt persists in irrupting into consciousness; it continues to trouble and irritate the believer. It emerges into consciousness whenever the believer becomes aware that his belief is being made the object of a critical analysis.

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

Here then is one of the powerful motives behind the suppression of freedom of thought. Such suppression is a device for the elimination from the environment of doubt-reviving stimuli. It is now possible to see what is meant by the statement that the intolerant person lacks faith. He doubts, but his doubts are repressed, and he lives in constant fear of their emergence. He dare not face them, and he knows it.

### THE AUTOCRACY OF THE INTOLERANT

Intolerance, censorship and suppression of thought have for so many centuries been associated with autocracies of every kind, that the conjunction of all these has always been taken for granted, which means that they have rarely been made the subject of reflection. Yet in this very fact of their conjunction is to be found a clue to the explanation of the things conjoined. It is of course well known that autocracy, whatever its kind, be it political, economic, ecclesiastical, military, domestic, or what not, fears free discussion for reasons too obvious to mention (one of the comic features of the usual attempts at the justification of autocracy of any kind is the straight-faced manner in which it is pretended not to no-

tice that which is only too obvious). But more can be said on the subject than that autocracy fears freedom of thought because it, autocracy, has so many things to conceal. Autocracy is paranoia operative in the sphere of social relations. The autocrat — and I am speaking of the autocrat of every conceivable kind — possesses a totalitarian mentality. There is no room in this wide world except for himself and the things he stands for. What the autocrat wants is power, and he will tolerate nothing that will limit that power. He is intolerant of dissentient opinion because in every such opinion he senses a limitation of his own power. This is the important thing to bear in mind. The intolerant person is a lover not of truth, but of power. That the fanatic is often intolerant is an observable fact. And modern psychologists are learning to look upon the fanatic as a paranoiac. People who think they have more insight than the psychologist never cease to express their admiration for the fanatic as an unusually sincere person and one extraordinarily devoted to his cause. Devoted he is, but the cause he is primarily devoted to is power — for himself.

Power is what the intolerant person wants. Dissentient views appear to him as a limitation of his power. They must therefore be exterminated, but

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

not by discussion, not by scientific experiment. Those things he dreads. They might reveal some truth to exist in the detested doctrines. Worse, they might expose some falsehood in his own. He is weighted down by his own suppressed internal doubts, and his own noisy, clamorous propaganda is partly a device for suppressing them and a screen to conceal them from himself and other people. Further, he is as a rule aware that he does not possess sufficient rational resources to make an entrance into the arena of discussion advisable.

### SEX - INTOLERANCE

There is a species of intolerance, a kind of censorship, that requires special attention. I have in mind sex censorship. The aforementioned factors of intolerance are present here, but an added and distinguishing factor is also at work. This additional factor is fear of sex.

That the sex-intolerant person is psychologically immature seems to have been definitely established by the psychoanalysts, and in particular by Theodore Schroeder, whose writings on the subject it would take several pages to list.

Now analysis of the sex-intolerant person reveals him as one who has failed to attain to



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

complete sexual maturity and who, in addition, is psychologically too immature to solve his sexual problem. That is to say, his rationality, his emotions and his will cannot cope with his problem. Analysis reveals him as the victim of a perpetual civil war raging within him. He is engaged in a ceaseless struggle against some inner sexual impulse, some impulse that he seeks to regulate or suppress. Trumbull, the eulogistic biographer of Anthony Comstock, describes him as waging war against his, Comstock's, inner tendency toward a certain kind of phantasying. St. Augustine confessed to such an internal conflict as I am here describing.

Against so powerful an impulsion as the sexual in any of its forms, the sex-intolerant person is constrained to summon to his aid such strong allies as the feelings of revulsion, hatred and disgust. He also finds it necessary to eliminate from his environment all stimuli tending to awaken the hateful impulse. He thereupon strikes at the symbols and expressions of sex, at all things suggestive of, or closely associated with it: sex literature, pictorial representations of sex, sculptured forms, discussions of sex, dancing, the nude body, abbreviated garments, divorce reform, birth control propaganda, and the gratification of sexual promptings generally. The entrance of any of

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

these stimuli into the consciousness of the sex-intolerant person stimulates the forbidden impulse, engenders a conflict, and excites his irritability and his feelings of revulsion, hatred and disgust. These then become focussed on the offending stimulus. Then follows an attempt to deal it a blow, to crush it, to suppress it, to eliminate it from consciousness, from the universe itself.

Thus intolerance for things sexual without appears to be prompted by the need for the suppression of sexual impulses within. The intolerant person seeks escape from his inner conflict not through some mature, rational, therapeutic method designed to make him whole, but through a frantic purge of his environment of all objects likely to reinforce the forbidden impulse. There have been oversensitive souls who have even avoided the company of the opposite sex. St. Augustine permitted no woman, not even his sister, to see him, except in the presence of other people. And finally there have been men who resorted to the desperate and decisive device of self-castration.

The intolerant person's repugnant, squeamish, violently emotional attitude toward sex is revealed by his choice of adjectives: dirty, obscene, filthy, vile, lewd, lascivious, sinful, immoral, disgusting — all these are prominent in his vocabulary. In using

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

them he thinks he is describing something objective, but he is only revealing his state of mind. His ideal is often, as in the case of the Christian Scientists, the Rosicrucians, and similar cultists, expressed in the belief in a future bodiless, "spiritual" race of humans.

It should now be clear that the moral crusader and the sex censor are not exactly illustrations of the freedom of the will. They are not always people who have freely chosen to pursue a certain moral ideal; they are quite likely to be victims of a morbid inner compulsion.

### CONFLICT OF ALTRUISTIC AND EGOISTIC IMPULSES

Recognition of the psychological immaturity of the intolerant person makes it possible to dispense with the notion that he is actuated solely by moral, social and patriotic motives. At this point we will anticipate a later discussion and say that conduct can never be adequately explained in terms of such motives. Moral, social and patriotic motives may be present, but the form in which they are expressed will be determined by the relative psychological maturity or immaturity of the person actuated by them. In the type of conduct

## *Intolerance as an Index of Immaturity*

under discussion the question must always be asked: why does this person's morality or patriotism take the form of intolerance? It is obviously not enough to take the intolerant person's word for it that he is impelled by no other motives than those of the purest patriotism and highest morality. Tolerant men and women explain their attitude in exactly the same terms. Clearly, patriotism and morality do not of themselves explain any intolerant act. Some other and additional factor is required. In order to apprehend this factor, a certain interesting fact about human nature must be kept in mind: an altruistic and an egoistic impulse will often effect a compromise. The character of the compromise will depend on a person's relative psychological maturity or immaturity. In an immature personality, the altruistic impulsion will acquire a form imposed upon it by an egoistic one. Hence, given a person possessed of the traits described in this chapter, the result will be a patriotism and a morality that find expression in intolerance, in persecution and in censorship.

## CHAPTER V

### THE TWO LEVELS OF HUMAN LIFE

HUMAN life can subsist on either one of two levels. One level is predominantly exploitative, competitive and autocratic in character; the other is prepotently democratic and co-operative. The first level is that of psychological immaturity, the other, that of psychological maturity.

On the immature level, the individual strives for growth at the expense of other individuals. On the mature level, behavior is guided by the principle that the fullest growth of the personality requires as a necessary condition the growth of other personalities, and is in its turn the prerequisite of their growth.

On the immature level, there is a heavy valuation of material wealth and power over human beings. They tend to become, and often do become, ends in themselves. On this level the primary activities are economic, political and military. Culture, in the sense in which this term has been defined, occupies a subordinate place or no place at all.



## *The Two Levels of Human Life*

On the mature level, a greater emphasis is laid on those values derivable from human comradeship and those procurable through creative and appreciative participation in art, science, religion, and philosophy. On this level, economic and political activities suffer demotion to a subordinate position. Military activities come to be regarded as an abomination. Were all or the majority of human beings psychologically mature, economic institutions would function merely as devices for the provision of material wealth; political institutions would be merely instruments to facilitate collective action in affairs affecting the welfare of an entire community. Military institutions would possess the dimensions and the functions of a police system. On the immature level, the illusion subsists that economic and political institutions function in the manner just described. Their real function on this level is, however, altogether different, and it will be described in a subsequent chapter.

On the immature level, rationality is in every way cramped, stunted and confined. The pre-occupation with economic, political and military affairs; the absence or subordination of cultural activity; the indiscriminate adulation of the life of action and the depreciation of the life of art and

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

of thought; the prevalence of intolerance and censorship; the expenditure of energy in the formulation of suitable rationalizations, pseudo-sciences and pseudo-philosophies as answers to the rational and ethical criticisms of exploitation, competition and autocracy: all these make for a prevalent irrationality and a confinement of rationality to precariously narrow limits.

On the immature level the dominant affects are the negative ones: anxiety, fear, hatred. At least it is very probable that these affects are experienced oftener, and by more people, than any other affect, self-love excepted. Sympathy and love of others exist, but they can hardly be expected to flourish in a society built on a basis of exploitation, competition and dictatorship. Group patriotisms of all kinds abound, but because competitive relations subsist between groups as well as they do among individuals, patriotism exhibits itself not so much as love of one's group as hatred for groups other than one's own. It is only necessary to refer to the fact that the exploitation of members of one's own group is at least as widespread a phenomenon as the exploitation of group by group.

## *The Two Levels of Human Life*

### CONJUGAL AND PARENTAL LOVE AMONG THE PSYCHOLOGICALLY IMMATURE

What of conjugal and parental love? There is of course a vast deal of both. But an exploitative and autocratic society imposes quantitative and qualitative limitations upon them. The organization of the family follows autocratic lines. The family is only too rarely a school for the mutual education of wills and the reciprocal fostering of growth. On the contrary, it is usually the place where the growth of the personality first begins to suffer arrest.

There are indeed two sorts of conjugal love, corresponding to the two levels of life. On the immature level, conjugal love is oriented toward a partner considered as a form of property and the actual or potential instrument of one's will. All those writers, poets, novelists and essayists who never tire of talking about the lover being a despot have the psychologically immature lover in mind. That is perhaps the only kind of lover they know. It is on this immature level that jealousy subsists. Jealousy is manifested when the beloved chattel becomes, or it is feared will become, the property and the instrument of another.

The presence of domestic tyranny in all coun-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

tries and at all times is another bit of evidence in favor of the thesis of the psychological immaturity of most of the members of the human race. Rare indeed has been the husband, the wife, the father, or the mother with sufficient intelligence to perceive that to place a check upon the growth of the other members of the family means the arrest of the growth of his or her own personality. And it is a sufficient commentary on the scale of values of an exploitative and autocratic society that it is usually sought to justify domestic tyranny on grounds of efficiency. The efficiently managed home must have a ruler — so runs the argument. Thus the home is conceived as if it were a factory or a shop, rather than a school for the nurture of personalities. It is not that either, but that is what it ought to be.

Certainly there is a vast deal of parental love. But the quality of this love too is determined by the degree of maturity of the parent. This fact is ignored by all those who keep repeating the false apothegm that love is enough. Love is never enough. There has always been parental love, but infant mortality began to decrease only when intelligence in the shape of science stepped in. In a few years science accomplished what countless centuries of parental love had failed to do. At all

## *The Two Levels of Human Life*

events, one is always right in suspecting the quality of a love that disdains to employ intelligence. The lover who feels no need for intelligence and reason has a delusion of infallibility.

A parent should be primarily an educator. And for the task of education love is not sufficient qualification. Love is not enough. And knowledge is not enough. Both love and knowledge are necessary, but for successful parenthood it is also essential that the parent shall be a psychologically mature person. Unless he is that, he is likely to deny to his child the privilege of acquiring a personality of his own. He — or she — will strive to make of the child a second edition of his, the parent's, self. He will utilize his parenthood as an opportunity for the gratification of his autocratic impulse. Himself psychologically immature, he will prevent his child from ever outgrowing psychological childhood.

The fact appears to be that parental love has never been great enough to induce parents to bring into being a world in which their sons and daughters could grow into complete human beings.

This world of psychologically immature men and women is so because the ancestors of these men and women were themselves psychologically immature.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### ILL HEALTH AND IMMATURITY

Exploitation, competition and autocracy, with their attendant stresses and strains, with the fears, terrors, anxieties and hatreds they generate, and with the poverty, misery and maladjustments they foster, are responsible for, to say the very least, a substantial proportion of physical and mental illness and disease. No school of medical thought doubts the connection between ways of life and health or lack of health. The connection is an established fact. It is noteworthy that statistics reveal an increase in the number of suicides among American business men. Thus competition, exploitation and autocracy not only thwart the growth and integration of the personality; they operate to disintegrate that which has had the good fortune to achieve a measure of integration.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE INFERIORITY OF RULING GROUPS

THE growth of others being the condition of the growth of one's self, it is not only the exploited subject, it is not merely the loser in the competitive struggle, but *the exploiter, the ruler, and the victor too, who exhibit immature personalities.*

Here is the refutation of those social philosophies which preach the necessity of exploitation, competition and autocracy for the nurture of aristocracy. In all times and in all places the doctrine has been prevalent that the growth of what were supposed to be the superior few requires the subjection and the exploitation of the many. This doctrine is false. The stunted growth of these who constitute the many involves the arrested maturation of those who make up the few. There is that about the exploitative, competitive and autocratic processes which is fatal to the complete growth of the exploiter and the autocrat.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### THE UNDERWORLD ARISTOCRACY

Ruling groups — economic, political, military, and ecclesiastical — have always exhibited the stigmata of psychological immaturity. Decisive evidence in favor of this proposition has already been adduced in the discussion of paranoidism in a preceding chapter. Further, it can be shown that ruling groups, all assiduously cultivated fictions to the contrary notwithstanding, have, generally speaking, not been intellectually, morally or volitionally superior to those they ruled. Whatever superiority they have exhibited has generally been of the executive or administrative kind. Further, they have actually been *inferior*, intellectually, morally, and volitionally, to the members of that minority, to be found in every society, which has always created and perpetuated *cultural* and *ethical* values. It is this minority, composed of the intellectually and ethically superior, which has constituted the only real aristocracy there ever was.

If ruling economic, political, ecclesiastical and military groups have ever constituted an aristocracy, it has been the aristocracy of the underworld. For business, politics, ecclesiasticism and war have always constituted an underworld. The world of the psychologically immature can never

## *The Inferiority of Ruling Groups*

be anything else. It can never be anything else but a realm governed by the principles of spiritual anthropophagy. It is a mistake to say that in this underworld it is the strong who rule the weak. Rather is it a case of the more cunning and more fortunately positioned weak ruling the less cunning and less fortunately positioned.

To those who might object to the use of the term *underworld* on the ground that it is too strong a word, that it is a word that should be reserved for the criminal elements of society, the answer should be made that the realms of business, politics, ecclesiasticism and war have always been continuous with, of a piece with, what is known as the criminal underworld. The criminal, too, is one who strives for growth at the expense of other personalities. And anyhow, crime in the actual legal sense of the term has always been a normal activity of the members of the worlds of business, politics, ecclesiasticism and war. One need only observe what goes on around him and read the newspapers and some realistic history to be convinced of that.

### RULING GROUPS NOT MORALLY SUPERIOR

That ruling groups have not been morally superior to the ruled is established by numerous

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

realistic histories, by the records of government investigation commissions and courts of justice, by intimate histories and biographies dealing with royal and so-called aristocratic families and individuals, by social analyses written by critics, radical and otherwise, and by candid passages in innumerable histories. Reference may here be made to books like H. H. Tiltman's *Terror in Europe*, H. C. Lea's *Superstition and Force*, Kropotkin's *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, Frederick L. Schuman's *Nazi Dictatorship*, George Seldes' *Sawdust Caesar*, the prophetic books in the Bible, Leon Whipple's *The Story of Civil Liberty in the United States*, Alfred Vagts' *The History of Militarism*, A. Curtis Wilgus' *South American Dictators*, H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighen's *Merchants of Death*, Gustavus Myers' *History of the Great American Fortunes*, *America Strikes Back*, *History of Canadian Wealth*, *History of the Supreme Court of the United States*, and *The History of Tammany Hall*, and Sterling E. Edmunds' *Lawless Law of Nations*.

Further proof that ruling groups are not morally superior is furnished by the fact of their exploitation of the ruled, by the corruptions and cruelties that have always attended this exploitation and by the fact that they have never en-



## *The Inferiority of Ruling Groups*

terained any scruples with regard to the means to be employed in repelling attacks on their power. Indeed, it has been in their reaction to attempts to limit or deprive them of their power that their paranoid mentality has revealed itself most prominently, and with all its fury, its cruelty, its bestiality.

If it be maintained that no ruling group can be expected to rise above the morals of its place and time, my rejoinder will be that a better way to put it is this, that no ruling group can be expected to rise above the moral level of the psychologically immature — the level of exploitation.

### RULING GROUPS NOT INTELLECTUALLY SUPERIOR

Ruling groups have not been intellectually superior to the ruled. They have revealed superior administrative and executive ability, they have been better informed, they have exhibited greater shrewdness and cunning, but none of this is necessarily an index of intellectual superiority. Ruling groups have as a matter of fact been contemptuous of intellection, and it is they, as much as anyone else, who have effected the unfortunate divorce between action and thought. Their education has

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

not as a rule included any training in the use of logic, scientific method, or the resources of philosophy.

I point out somewhere else (*The Critique of Poor Reason*) that without some such training, there can be little genuine intellection and only a feeble grasp of reality. Reality cannot be known merely through contact with things and people; experience alone teaches nothing; were it otherwise, science would be unnecessary. Reality can be known through systematic observation and reflection. *Reflection is absolutely essential*. Observation is itself largely dependent upon antecedent knowledge and thought, for to observe one must know what to look for. Experience is an insufficient guide to reality. It merely furnishes the material for reflection. Experience becomes a good teacher only when it is made the object of thought. Experience teaches nothing to those who cannot learn.

The point that it is sought to make here is this. With reference to the intellectual level attained by scientists, artists, philosophers, prophets and some ethical reformers, the members of ruling groups subsist on the same plane as the ruled. That is to say, the members of ruling groups are intellectually as far behind the most intelligent mem-

## *The Inferiority of Ruling Groups*

bers of the human race as those they rule. It does not alter matters to point to the exceptions among the members of ruling groups. The exceptions are exceptions. Statistical studies of the heredity of genius and great artistic, scientific and philosophical talent indicate that the bulk of these is contributed by the professional groups.

The point can be put this way. Here, as in so many other things, *rulers are a part of what is known as the masses*. They do not protrude above the mass, but subsist *on the same low level with it*. The average member of a ruling group acquires his ideas concerning the world and things within it from the social milieu in the same uncritical way as does any member of the masses. He is just as thoroughly addicted to fallacy, to delusion, to slipshod thought, to prejudice, to emotionally-charged thought, and to pleasant lies as the majority of men and women.

### RULING GROUPS NOT VOLITIONALLY SUPERIOR

It will, however, be stoutly maintained that even if ruling groups have not been morally and intellectually superior to the ruled, they have most certainly revealed a volitional superiority. Ruling

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

groups, it will be asserted, have been composed of persons possessed of stronger wills. I think this can be shown to be false.

The trouble here lies in a failure to make a very important distinction. It is necessary to distinguish between two kinds of persistence: the persistence of the person of strong will, and that of the person who continues in a certain course because he is the victim of an inner compulsion over which he is too weak to exercise control. The behavior of ruling groups can be explained on the assumption of their inability to exercise any great degree of control over their exploitative and autocratic impulses. They do not control these impulses; they are controlled by them. It is not so much that they will to exploit, to compete, to dictate; rather is it that they lack the will to refrain from these things, to place a check upon these impulses. They lack the strength of will to lift themselves from the exploitative, competitive and autocratic level to the democratic and co-operative — from the level on which human growth suffers arrest to one where liberated growth goes on to maturity.

No, ruling groups do not furnish models of strong will. Their paranoid behavior, particularly in social crises, is anyhow incompatible with voli-

## *The Inferiority of Ruling Groups*

tional strength and health. It is not irrelevant to point to the increasing number of suicides among American business men: suicide is hardly a sign of strength of will.

I wish at this point to give credit to A. A. Roback, who, in his book, *Psychology of Character*, classes tyrants and dictators as weak of will.

Finally, and once and for all, it is a sign that economic, political, ecclesiastical and military rulers have not been intellectually, morally and volitionally mature that they have in all places and at all times perpetuated ways of life and social systems that thwarted the growth of their own personalities, and that they instead resisted, with paranoid rage and violence, even the thought of experimentation with social procedures that promised the liberation of human growth.

It will be objected that within the ranks of ruling groups there have appeared many great men: great kings, emperors, statesmen, presidents, soldiers, entrepreneurs, financiers, churchmen, judges, and so on. Answer to this objection must be postponed until a point further down, where a criterion of greatness will be offered.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### A DANGEROUS DECEPTION

Around the word *aristocracy* a great deception has been built. Aristocracy is, of course, an undeniable fact. Human beings are unequal in capacity. But when those who are in any respect inferior long to be aristocrats, and cannot become such, they do the next best thing. They create in themselves the delusion of being aristocrats, and put themselves forward as such. This is the great deception that economic, political, ecclesiastical, and military ruling groups have always practiced on themselves and the human race.

That which has hitherto been called aristocracy has been intellectually, morally and volitionally *a part of the masses*. What has passed under the name of nobility has been intellectually and morally quite ignoble. Politicians, heads of states, business men, ecclesiastical rulers, and military leaders have in all except a relatively small number of exceptions been intellectually, morally and volitionally quite plebeian. It is time to bring to an end one of the most widespread, long-lived and dangerous deceptions of all time. And it is very important that it should be. On the mistaken assumption of the superiority of the "aristocracy," all sorts of atrocities and brutalities directed against

## *The Inferiority of Ruling Groups*

social movements striving for the improvement of the lot of the masses and the democratization of any of the departments of life have been tolerated. The repression of these movements, even by terroristic means, has been defended on the ground that their success would have involved the demotion to an inferior status of the "elite."

## CHAPTER VII

### POWER, REAL AND ILLUSORY

ONE of the great desiderata of those who subsist on the immature level is power over human beings. With many of those who live on this level it is indeed the greatest desideratum. To command, to order people about, to determine their destinies for them, to strut about among followers and lackeys and lickspittles, to be recognized by the world as a leader, and to be addressed as chief, boss, governor, president, dictator, king, constitute for these people the greatest of all values.

Everywhere and always human beings have played at this childish, personality-arresting game of who-will-be-master-of-whom. Wherever human beings have organized a community, whether it was one as small as the family or as large as a nation, they have pitched into this game, and without inquiring whether the game helped or hindered their best interests. In my boyhood days I was a member of many a club. No sooner did we young folks organize one but we would com-

## *Power, Real and Illusory*

mence a struggle to determine who would be boss. It was all rather silly, childish and pathetic. But it was no sillier, no more pathetic, no more childish than the historic conflicts for power have been.

The most pathetic thing about this warfare is the fact that the power sought for and gained is largely illusory! This is necessarily so, for exploitation and autocracy are really mutual in character. In an exploitative and autocratic society, everyone exploits everyone else, and ruling groups practice dictation upon each other. Within any given community, any given ruling individual or group finds itself under a constraint to make concessions to other ruling individuals or groups, and even to the masses. Further, any ruling individual can maintain his position only if and when he can gratify the demands of his henchmen and lieutenants for their share of power and material wealth. No one can be dictator who cannot submit to dictation himself. Being dictator and being dictated to seem to be as inseparable as the two sides of a coin.

Because on the immature level everyone strives for power over others, because every person competes with, and strives to exploit everyone else, everybody is constantly seeking to limit everyone else's power. As a result, social institutions are not

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

only devices for the acquisition and exercise of power; they tend to become means for the negation of power. Everyone is constantly engaged in an attempt to tie everybody else's hands. This is one reason for the futility of social institutions in the past and in the present.

It is one of the great illusions of all time that it is in the worlds of politics, business, and ecclesiastical and military affairs that great power can be enjoyed.

### MAXIMAL POWER IS CULTURAL

It is on the mature level and in the realm of culture that strength and power are genuine and maximal. The nature of culture, as this book defines it, is such as to make for the liberation and augmentation of power; the ways of life and the social institutions on this level are devices for the reciprocal enhancement of power. Such is the character of culture that the growth and exercise of power at any point require and impel the release, enjoyment and augmentation of power at other points. In the world of culture, no one can exercise power unless others also do. He who would be free must aid others maintain their freedom. The personality grows if and when other personalities do.



## *Power, Real and Illusory*

In the republic of culture the paradox holds true that one's independence is made possible by his dependence on others — and not on slaves, either.

All this is fairly obvious. It is necessary to deal at this point with the argument which will no doubt be advanced, that mutuality and interdependence are just as real and just as necessary in the economic, political, ecclesiastical and military worlds. To be sure, they are. But there are differences. Because those worlds are so thoroughly exploitative, competitive and autocratic in character, co-operation, wherever it does exist, enjoys a somewhat precarious status. Their collaboration is in large part that of exploiter and exploited, dictator and subject, master and slave. This kind of co-operation involves the reduction of human beings to the status of instruments or forms of property. Such a reduction is probably impossible without an arrest of personality growth. And if the growth of one requires that of others, then the personality of the exploiter too suffers arrest.

Significant for the distinction between the cultural and non-cultural realms is the difference in the methods employed in dealing with divergences in outlook and policy. It is a commonplace

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

that artists, scientists, philosophers and prophets do not as a general thing resort to violence, military warfare, lynch law, imprisonment and torture; true, they have been known on occasion to employ censorship and to apply economic and social pressure, but withal there is a difference. How is it to be explained? The popular explanation that the difference is due to their mildness is obviously a tautology. Nor is it possible to accept any such explanation as this, that cultural issues are fraught with consequences less grave than those which preoccupy the noncultural world, and that they are therefore less exciting. It is simply not true that cultural issues are less important; on the contrary, there are no issues that are more important. No, the difference in the method of meeting divergences of policy and ideology is traceable to the relatively greater psychological maturity of the inhabitants of the world of culture. They are relatively free of the paranoias and paranoidisms that afflict the population of the underworld, that is, the noncultural world. The psychologically immature person is characterized by an exclusive attitude. He wishes the world to reflect only himself or his group. The psychologically mature person is characterized by an inclusive attitude. He envisages the world as a mosaic composed of

## *Power, Real and Illusory*

contributions from many sources, himself and his group included. His preference is therefore for a society composed of collaborators, as against one made up of dictators and dictated, exploiters and exploited, masters and slaves.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE REPUBLIC OF CULTURE

THERE is, then, a department of life regulated to a relatively great degree by the principle that the growth of the personality is conditioned by, and is in its turn the condition of the growth of other personalities. This department, or better, this level constitutes a world of its own, a spiritual continent, settled by a relatively democratic, rational, and co-operative community. This is the world of culture in its higher reaches: the creation and appreciation of art, science, religion, philosophy, as well as the creation of ethical value. Ethical value may be said to be attached to any way of life that furthers the maturation of one or more human beings. This excludes all exploitative and autocratic behavior-patterns from the realm of the ethical. Anyone who aids in the creation or maintenance of growth-facilitating, that is, democratic and co-operative behavior-patterns, is a contributor to the store of ethical value.

It is in the realm of culture that one finds

## *The Republic of Culture*

human beings combining to release and augment human energy, not to confine and suppress it. Here human capacities flourish and attain their apogee. Here the personality does indeed mature. Here one may truly speak of intellect developed to the stage of talent and genius, of emotion become rich and full, of will grown straight and strong. Very properly may one speak here of human beings grown richly adult. The realm of culture is the greatest of all republics, the most democratic of all communities, the most co-operative of all commonwealths. Its citizens constitute the real aristocracy, the genuine nobility, the true elite.

All of which is of course not to receive a naïve interpretation. It is admittedly a statement that requires some qualification. It is a statement that is only relatively true. There have always been artists, scientists, philosophers and ethical heroes whose orientation toward certain things was mature, but whose attitude toward certain other things was decidedly immature. There have been creators and sustainers of culture whose position in society was made possible by membership in an exploitative class. There have been artists, scientists and philosophers who strove to make culture itself an advocate of exploitative, competitive and dictatorial ways of life. Standing outside of the



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

realm of culture, however, are those counterfeiters who have merely passed for artists, scientists and philosophers: the concealers and perverters of truth, the makers of lies, the conscious creators of sophisms. It is not always possible to tell between the genuine and the counterfeit, but that does not make the distinction any the less real. Of him or her, on the other hand, whose growth does not take place at the expense of others, but whose maturation does indeed further that of others: of such a one it can be said that though he never creates or appreciates an artistic, scientific, religious or philosophical product, he is nonetheless a true citizen of the commonwealth of culture. He is a creator or sustainer of ethical values.

## CHAPTER IX

### A QUALIFICATION

IT is freely granted that the fundamental distinction drawn in this book is too sharp. The maturest people are incompletely mature. On the other hand, almost every adult attains some degree of intellectual, emotional or volitional maturity. There are people with one foot on the mature level and the other on the immature. These respond in a rational, democratic and co-operative manner to certain social situations; to other social situations their response is irrational, exploitative, competitive and autocratic. There have been economic, political, ecclesiastical and military leaders who exhibited quite a deal of psychological maturity. On the other hand, among the creators of culture as it has been defined in this book, there have been many whose personality exhibited not a little that was immature. There have even been among the makers and sustainers of culture those who have sought to make it, culture, an instrument for the

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

perpetuation of life on the immature level — for the maintenance of exploitative, competitive and autocratic modes of behavior and social institutions. There have been scientists — at least they considered themselves such — who sought, by the use of methods of dubious scientific character, to depict exploitation, competition and autocracy as functions of ineradicable elements they thought they discerned in what they termed human nature — or as the bearers of biological, economic or civilizing values. There have been artists who have, through one medium or another, given expression to the ecstasy aroused in them by dictators, military men, battlefields, successful exploiters, even sadistic men and women. And there have been philosophers who penetrated right into the very core of the universe and brought back to the ruling groups the comforting news that this cosmic core was exploitation, competition and autocracy. All things struggle against one another, all things live off each other, and the will to power is the will to life itself. In the exercise of power life reaches its apogee. And life lives on life, or rather on the conversion of life, the life of others, into death. If he would retain his strength, man must, to the end of his days, remain spiritually a cannibal. When life lives at the expense of life,

## *A Qualification*

when life deals death, the principle of "aristocracy" is preserved.

Thus do the "ideals" of paranoia penetrate into the sancta of culture.

It is one of the tragic anomalies of history that among the citizens of the republic of culture, that realm where there are to be found the maturest spirits and the most democratic ways, there should be those who would employ culture to keep men and women from the acquisition of their fullest stature, and life from being transformed into a cultural, as against an economic, political and military enterprise.

With all these qualifications, however, my thesis stands. It remains true, I think, that the greater mass of mankind and of its economic, political, ecclesiastical and military leadership, past and present, has been composed of individuals predominantly immature psychologically, as evidenced by their adherence to exploitative, competitive and autocratic behavior-patterns; a minority of individuals has exhibited personalities predominantly mature psychologically, as evidenced by their relatively more rational, democratic and co-operative responses to social situations. Human history and human problems require therefore a radically new kind of interpretation.

## CHAPTER X

### AN INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

THE history of civilization is the story of a struggle, a struggle between two opposed ways of life; between the principle that the growth of the personality requires the denial of the growth of other personalities, and the principle that the growth of one requires and enhances that of others. The conflict is one between the exploitative, competitive and autocratic mode of life, and the co-operative and democratic one; between paranoia and paranoidism on the one hand and rationality on the other; between the conception of life as properly occupied with the economic and political, and one that envisages it as concerned primarily with the cultural. In short, the conflict is one between the two levels of human life: the one of psychological immaturity, the other of psychological maturity.

#### THE REAL FUNCTION OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Everything that has been said up to this point yields a perspective upon history, a standpoint from which to interpret its events, as well as a



## *An Interpretation of History*

confirmation of numerous critiques of past and present society. In the light of the psychological immaturity of our ancestors and of our contemporaries, in the light of the exploitative, competitive and autocratic past and present, the ways of life and the social institutions of that past and this present can now be seen for what they really have been. Economic institutions have been largely a device, not for the provision of society with the material conditions of life, but rather for the concentration of power and material wealth in the hands of economic rulers. Economic institutions have not existed for society; society has served as so much exploitable material from which power could be wrested and out of which material wealth could be wrung. The society of human beings has been among the raw materials and the instruments, yes, part of the capital, almost the property of the owners of industry. Surely, when one considers that throughout the historical era wealth has been concentrated in the hands of a minority, while the majority has been doomed to perpetual economic misery, it is not taking up an extreme position to assert that, as a general thing, the primary function of economic institutions has not been that of the provision of society with the material conditions of human life.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

It is a sign of psychological maturity to substitute a more efficient way of living for one less efficient. It is indeed a sign of the psychological immaturity of the men and women of the past and present that they have almost always not only tolerated but stoutly defended economic systems which failed to lift the majority out of the slough of economic misery even in the midst of fabulous and unbelievable plenty. It is a sign of the psychological immaturity of the masses and their economic and political leaders that not all of the misery, the frightful, indescribable misery that grows out of an exploitative economic system can induce most of them even to consider whether that system ought not to be replaced by some other. Certainly they maintain that it is not the system that breeds the miseries in question. To which the answer is that the majority of those who talk in this fashion have spent no time in the consideration of the question. Their voice is merely that of an uninformed and psychologically immature irrationalism. It is the voice of those whose notion of the good life has been molded by the exploitative and competitive level on which they live and who know no other level, no other life, no other values.

The world is very naïve. It is composed of

## *An Interpretation of History*

people who esteem themselves very practical and realistic, but this itself is proof of their naïvete. Because commodities are put on sale, they think that business exists to serve the consumer. Because commodities are used, they think they are made to be used. And because government is called government, and because the various branches of government pass and enforce laws and issue decrees, people draw therefrom the inference that governments govern. And further, because everything that governments do, they professedly do in the name of something called the state, and because governments continually call upon the individual to subordinate himself to the "state" — in reality the ruling groups — people fondly imagine that governments exist to serve them who supposedly make up the state — the people. Now governments do govern, to some extent. But what is not generally known is this, that governments can be, and in fact almost always have been, governed. And on the exploitative level it can hardly be otherwise. On that level, government is set up by and for the exploiters. It is their political tool, the instrument with which they are enabled to acquire and enjoy power. Not that the esteemed and honorable members of government are always merely pliant and subservient tools of the economic ex-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

plotters. At times the relationship between the economic and political rulers is rather like that of a partnership. Indeed, the four sets of rulers and exploiters — the economic, the political, the military, and the ecclesiastical — often enter into some sort of working arrangement, some kind of division of spheres of influence, some species of partnership which enables them to gratify the twin appetites for power and material wealth. It is no argument against this thesis that these groups do not always have things their own way, that they do as a matter of fact perform certain real and vital services, and that they do make some concessions to the masses. The concessions have had to be wrung out of them, and the greatest vigilance is always required to keep them from coming to an abrupt end. And for the services the ruling groups perform they exact and obtain a heavy recompense. They never fail to charge what they think the service is worth and what they are certain the traffic will bear.

It is not necessary to dwell at length on what these four exploiting groups have done to humanity in the past and are doing to it in the present. Realistic histories in which the exploitative process receives extended treatment have been written. Here it is not so much the details of this process,

## *An Interpretation of History*

as its significance for the thesis of the book which requires to be touched on. Economic, political, military and ecclesiastical institutions, all social institutions — cultural institutions, using the word *cultural* as defined in this book, excepted — have hitherto been sets of relations among psychologically immature human beings. Now psychologically immature human beings subsist on an exploitative, competitive and autocratic level. This is the level on which the individual strives to grow at the expense of others. On this level the dominant activities are economic, political and military. Hence, social institutions on this level have as one of their functions the gratification of the craving for power and material wealth of those who succeed in occupying strategic points in the institutional economy. And so economic institutions have been primarily devices for the concentration of power and material wealth in the hands of economic rulers. Governments have been largely instrumentalities for the realization of the power ambitions of political leaders, for the gratification of their craving for material wealth and for the perpetuation of economic exploitation. Military institutions have been primarily instruments for the expression of tribal and national egotisms, for the satisfaction of the military leaders' quest for



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

power and for glory, and for the realization of the imperialist ambitions of economic and political rulers. Ecclesiastical institutions have existed to offer solace to a world steeped in every kind of misery, to gratify the longing of churchmen for their share of power and material wealth, and to propagate the notion of the divine ordination of exploitative, competitive and autocratic social systems and ways of life.

### THE RATIONAL AND ALTRUISTIC MYTH — THE ETIQUETTE ASSUMPTION

In casting aside the idyllic notion that past and present human societies have been composed of intellectually, emotionally and volitionally mature folk, it will also be necessary to discard the romantic interpretation of historic deeds in terms of a dominant rationality and a prepotent altruism. So much, ever so much of what passes for historiography is merely mythology, dealing with a non-existent mankind composed of psychologically mature persons, equipped with a superb rationality and actuated by the loftiest altruism. And hardly anything more is needed to establish the unscientific, mythopoetic character of much of what is called social science than this, that it has its roots

## *An Interpretation of History*

in just such history. Underneath so much of what is written and said concerning human deeds there lies what may be termed the etiquette assumption. This is the assumption that human beings by and large, and their leaders especially, are impelled by altruistic motives, and this even when their deeds lead to the widest and most acute distress. There is no warrant in experience for such an assumption. Nevertheless, the etiquette assumption is employed almost universally, and this because it is not considered nice, it is considered libelous to attribute any but the best of motives to folks. Walter Lippmann somewhere says that a scientist who should entertain only such conclusions as are moral or constitutional would be a joke. To this one may add, any scientist who should entertain only such conclusions as are nice and are not in violation of etiquette would surely be a joke. And there have been myriads of such scientists. They simply assume, as a matter of etiquette — of all reasons — that this hero or that leader or this people or that nation was prompted by a powerful altruism and guided by a brilliant and light-shedding rationality.

The extent to which this mythopoesis is pushed is revealed by the fact that even though the conduct of a people or a community or a ruling group

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

or a "hero" issue in the destruction of the most precious values and the infliction of the most acute suffering, historians and social scientists of the etiquette school will not even inquire into the possibility that immature impulses may have been operating. The etiquette assumption is indeed responsible for the failure of historians and social scientists to learn the elementary psychological lesson that altruistic impulses often effect a compromise with egotistic ones, so that the resultant is a line of conduct gratifying to both sets, the egoist one especially. This simple psychological lesson has not yet penetrated into the heads of newspaper editors and reporters. Even when altruism is an actuating factor, it is very often an altruism operating through expedients quite gratifying to the egotistic impulses of the doer. Once this is perceived, it becomes possible to explain why "good" people have so often inflicted so much injury to humanity and to human values.

The well-known phenomenon of rationalization enters here as the intellectual medium of reconciliation between altruism and egotistic impulses. Rationalization is an uncritical and sophistic type of reflection, the aim of which is not to frame an accurate description of reality, but rather to make it appear to oneself and to others

## *An Interpretation of History*

that one's conduct is entered upon with due regard to values higher in the scale than those that are actually the object of pursuit. It is, in other words, an attempt to dress up an immature impulse to make it look like something on a higher, more mature level. In order that rationalization shall be effective it is necessary that the rationalizer and those he unwittingly deceives shall not have advanced far enough toward intellectual maturity to possess one of the distinguishing features thereof: the ability to be rationally critical.

### ILLUSTRATIONS OF ROMANTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

It will be useful to consider some examples of idyllic historical interpretation.

Instance Mead's explanation in his *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century* of the frightful suffering that attended the unfoldment of the industrial revolution. He refers to the hideous conditions under which men, women and children worked, to the children transferred from orphan asylums to factories, driven to work with whips, kept at work until they could not keep their eyes open. But, he assures us, all this was not the result of heartlessness! Indeed, children were

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

employed because it was deemed an act of kindness to place a child where he could acquire the habit of industriousness. As for the awful sufferings the workers were compelled to endure, these were due to the rapidity with which the industrial development took place, and to the inability to foresee what this development would bring with it.

If an employer who uses whips on children is not heartless, one wonders what a really heartless one would use. But there is no warrant for Mead's position. He seems to proceed on the basis of the mythical prevalent goodness of human beings. If all that were desired was the implantation in children of the habit of industriousness, then why did not factory owners place their own children in the shops? And why the whip and the keeping of children at work until their eyes could keep open no longer, if education were the real purpose?

Rapidity of development and lack of foresight do not explain the efforts of factory owners to retain the largest share of their profits and pay starvation wages to their employees. That is better explained in terms of cupidity. The rapid development of the industrial revolution does not explain the viciousness with which the earliest attempts at union organization were met. Nor



## *An Interpretation of History*

does it explain why slum conditions were tolerated for decades. Besides, the industrial development was not rapid in the sense that it took a few days, weeks or months. It spanned decades. It provided ample time for adjustments, and these would have taken place had there been a disposition to effect them.

No, the miseries that attended the industrial revolution did not result from the operation of impersonal forces. They did not persist against the opposition of a generous humanity. They grew out of the fact that the revolution transpired in a world in which the prevalent conception of the good life was one lived at the expense of everybody else. The industrial revolution was an exploitative revolution.

Now take the case of Henry Charles Lea and his book *Superstition and Force*, already mentioned in another part of this book. The matchless thoroughness with which this book has been compiled and the wealth of learning it displays have their foil in Lea's naïvete and ignorance of human psychology. He ascribes the use and persistence of the ordeal, with all its cruelties, to faith in God. The ordeal was a divine instrument through which God unfailingly separated the innocent from the guilty. Lea does not explain how

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

this faith in God and the ordeal survived the frequent cases in which the innocent were discovered to have been erroneously convicted. Lea does not explain why this faith in God did not manifest itself by a reliance on devices less cruel than the ordeal. Why could not a flip of a coin reveal the divine judgment as readily as the torture of the ordeal? More important, Lea never asks himself what sort of men and women were they whose conceptions of deity and justice found expression through the cruelties of the ordeal.

And now listen to Lea explain the widespread use and the long persistence of the system of judicial torture with all its frightful cruelties. Lea's explanation is one of the worst examples of rationalistic interpretation. Its naïvete is incomparable. The Catholic inquisitors tortured for the sake of God and mankind. They were certain of the truth of Catholic doctrine; they wished to protect God from the insults and blasphemies of heresy; they sought to bring heretics into the Catholic communion in order to place them in a position to win eternal salvation. The example set by the church was contagious, and after the commencement of the Inquisition the employment of torture by secular courts for the extraction of testimony and confessions became universal. This development

## *An Interpretation of History*

was abetted by the study of Roman law, which prescribed torture. This is Lea's easy explanation of the establishment of judicial torture in the secular courts of Europe: secular judges and lawyers accepted it because Roman law prescribed it and the Catholic Church sanctioned it. In the book under consideration Lea never asks what it was that made these lawyers and judges so receptive to the prescriptions of Roman law and the church in the matter of torture. He does not inquire into their psychology, not even to ascertain why they and practically everybody else remained for centuries singularly impervious to the oft-repeated argument that under torture innocent persons may confess to anything. He even takes very seriously and humorlessly the "natural" doubts expressed by eighteenth-century German jurists who refused to give up the system of judicial torture with which they were so familiar, in favor of untried "experiments" with so "crude" and "illogical" a device as the acquittal of defendants against whom the testimony was inconclusive!

Lea does not, in the book under discussion, inquire why, if faith in the truth of one's doctrine expresses itself in the torture of dissenters, Jesus, Gautama, Confucius, Socrates, Plato, Spinoza,

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

Maimonides and Anselm did not practice it on their opponents. He does not ask why those who believed in an omnipotent and benevolent deity should have arrogated to themselves the duty of protecting him against blasphemy. It is of course asking too much of Lea to expect him to inquire why the believer refuses to entertain the possibility that it is his, rather than the other fellow's doctrine which may be the erroneous one. Nor did it seem possible for Lea to put to himself these simple queries: what sort of person is it who selects torture as a mode of argument? What kind of personality does he possess whose solicitude for another's eternal salvation finds expression through such fearful channels?

Some time ago I heard one of the most prominent American philosophers assert that business men are honest, and that they steal simply because the economic system, as at present constituted, compels them to. He forgot to explain why honest men should prefer to perpetuate a system that compels theft.

In *South American Dictators*, edited by A. Curtis Wilgus, Lewis W. Bealer writes concerning Jose de Francia, for twenty-nine years (1811-1840) dictator of Paraguay, that he did not seek power for power's sake, but that his objective was

## *An Interpretation of History*

the benefit of his country as he saw it. And he quotes a Paraguayan scholar named Cecilio Baez, who says that a man of Francia's type does not love power, but utilizes it to establish order or to realize some end. There is altogether too much of this kind of scholarship. Baez and Bealer and people like them think they write history, but they are really composing second-rate epic myths. Lincoln is quoted as saying that four years in the White House are sufficient to arouse in the incumbent a passionate desire to lengthen his stay. Baez and Bealer can nonetheless maintain that one can taste power for twenty-nine years and not be affected by it! Those who write concerning dictators in the manner of Bealer and Baez proceed on the basis of a romantic psychology. They are also addicted to that over-simplifying type of thought which divides human beings into pure altruists and pure egotists. But a human being is not all of a piece. In a human being, altruistic and egotistic impulses are forever present, forever clashing, forever effecting compromises. A person's reaction to a social situation depends to a large extent on his ability to strike a balance between them. Often an altruistic or patriotic impulse gets itself expressed in a manner quite gratifying to the egotistic side of the personality. One must there-



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

fore dismiss from consideration the kind of historiography which traces political absolutism to absolute altruism. Every human being has at least a faint desire to exercise power, and the capacity to enjoy such exercise. It is idle to assert that this hunger for power, a hunger often so ravenous, plays no significant role in the determination of the conduct of him who strives for, acquires and exercises dictatorial powers. This hunger is not the source of all human conduct. But it contributes its share to the determination thereof.

It is an indication of the kind of history-writing Bealer represents that he conceives Francia to have been free of a passion for power when his, Bealer's, own account discloses in Francia traits that can be set down as the stigmata of some sort of psychological morbidity: misanthropy, lovelessness, inability to forgive, belief in the divine ordination of his mission, a desire to emulate Napoleon (in fairness it should be stated that he admired Benjamin Franklin even more), terrorist tactics, and the kidnapping and arbitrary treatment of the French naturalist, Bonpland. Traits such as these are often associated with an inordinate desire for power.

There is a very important consideration that is always overlooked by those who see in a dictator

## *An Interpretation of History*

a patriot who is merely preserving his country against anarchy. The question whether dictatorship is justifiable as a cure for chaos is not under discussion here. At this moment psychology, not ethics, is being discussed. The important consideration to bear in mind is this. A period of social disorder is a time when the conflict for power has reached a point where the old arrangements and the normal state of equilibrium have been upset. What the psychologically immature participants want is power or profit or both. When one contestant succeeds in imposing his dictatorship on the others, his motives are likely to be no different from theirs. But if he succeeds in retaining his position he becomes the object of worship and adulation, legends spring up about him, and he emerges a savior, a sterling patriot, a selfless hero.

No good reason exists for supposing that a successful seeker for political power is actuated by motives that differ in the smallest particular from those of the unsuccessful ones.

The idyllic notion that intolerance of dissent is evidence of faith, and that suppression of dissentient opinion and tabooed thoughts has a purely altruistic and patriotic basis, has already received treatment in the chapter on intolerance.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### FALSE PSYCHOLOGICAL NOTIONS

How slight is the understanding of the psychology of the immature can be gleaned from the fact that the conduct of fanatic individuals and groups, destructive of values though it may be, is applauded whenever it appears to possess what is termed sincerity. Indeed, the amount of frenzy and fury exhibited by fanatics is supposed to be a reliable index of their sincerity. The frenzy and fury are then mistaken for enthusiasm and zeal. But the sincerity of fanatics is dubious. It is often illusory. The fanatic who pursues his course utterly impervious to the criticism that he is destroying values greater than those he is creating, if any, and who refuses even to inquire into the truth of the criticism, can by no stretch of the imagination be termed sincere. No one who is truly sincere wants to sacrifice greater values to gain lesser ones. It is no answer that the fanatic deems the values he pursues greater than those he destroys. One of the keys to the comprehension of the fanatic's psychology is the fact of his extraordinary imperviousness to criticism of his evaluations. To put the matter differently, the fanatic has a delusion of infallibility in full bloom. And this delusion is part of the fanatic's paranoiac

## *An Interpretation of History*

syndrome — the typical fanatic is a typical paranoiac. But the paranoiac is interested in power, not truth. He rejects criticism, and with anger, fury and sometimes violence, because he envisages criticism as an attempted limitation of his power. This subject, however, has already received treatment in the chapter on intolerance.

Recognition of the role played by immature impulses in the determination of human behavior has been handicapped by a certain inadequate method of interpretation. This is the telic method, the interpretation of an act by reference to the purpose the act is alleged to subserve. This is indeed a mode of interpretation that is universally employed, but it is a most inadequate method. Of any given deed it is not sufficient to say that it was performed in a given way because it was wanted to attain a given end, if there was more than one way of attaining that end. In such a case, the end does not explain the choice of means, since there was more than one set of means to choose from. An adequate statement of the case then requires an explanation of the choice of means. Why was this means chosen rather than another? The answer lies in this: among the factors determining the choice of means is the degree of maturity of the chooser. According as he is

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

more or less mature, his choice will tend to fall on rational, co-operative and democratic, or on exploitative, competitive and autocratic modes of dealing with social situations.

If, however, one insists on the telic interpretation of human behavior, if one persists in viewing the behavior of men and women solely in terms of its objectives, it really makes no difference as far as the point of view here expounded is concerned. Think in terms of ends, if you will, but bear in mind that the ends chosen are themselves tokens of greater or lesser psychological maturity. The degree of such maturity a person possesses will be a factor in the determination of his choice of democratic and cultural, or exploitative and paranoid values.

### MYSTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

Another type of historical interpretation that needs to be abandoned is of that mystic, impersonal sort which describes historical events in terms of vague, depersonalized social forces. The latter allegedly impel helpless human beings towards this or that type of behavior, and this regardless of their wishes and their wills. Thus, a world full of kind and gentle men and women is



## *An Interpretation of History*

impelled by economic and social needs to the commission of acts of cruelty. Thus also, a world jammed with peace-loving folk is pushed into one war after another. This is all nonsense. All this talk about impersonal social forces acting upon human beings from above, and in utter disregard of their wishes, is false. Social forces do not exist apart from the motives, the impulses, the wishes, the wills of men and women. It is the human material of which society is composed that gives social forces their shape and their direction. Social or economic forces, whatever they may be, cannot impose exploitative, competitive and autocratic ways of life upon men and women who are not inclined to gratify an immature craving for power and material wealth. Nor can they impel races and nations toward conflict unless these races and nations subsist on the level where the growth of a group is imagined to be possible only at the expense of other groups. No social or economic developments can induce the emergence of an androcracy or a gynarchy unless there be present in men and women the immaturity that is expressed through sado-masochistic trends.

No, it will not do to speak of social forces as if they were things apart from human dispositions, habits and desires. They do not descend upon

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

society from above, they well up from within it. It is misleading to speak of them as impelling or compelling human wills to act this way and that: they are those wills in action. It is true enough that any given individual may be bowled over or swept along by these forces; but these latter are nothing apart from the attitudes, wills and passions of the men and women who make up the world he lives in.

This discussion is of the utmost significance, for it issues in something like a confirmation of the proposition that the mass of men and women is psychologically immature. Consider: if social forces are to be identified with the wills, impulses, passions and habits of human beings, and if these forces are so often destructive of human values, as indeed they are, then the very destructiveness of these forces attests to the immaturity of the wills and impulses and passions in question. That is to say, if social forces issue so often in war, revolutionary excess, crime waves, business depression, heresy hunts, and similar phenomena, the reason for that lies in the relative degree of maturity attained, or perhaps it is better to say not attained, by the human components of society. All the talk of "good" men and women compelled by social forces to behave in a manner quite out of

## *An Interpretation of History*

keeping with their goodness, is an evasion of the true state of affairs.

### PARETO'S FALLACY

Consider Pareto's statement that the chief element in the behavior of ruling groups is the social system, and not the conscious will of individuals. These must not be thought of as executing wicked designs by means of dark stratagems. Such a conception, he insists, is merely a fairy-tale. The conception of a something called a social system impelling individuals toward acts of exploitation, competition, corruption, deception, and war, *and this apart from their volitions*, is not a fairy-tale! Pareto, however, reverses himself on the very next page: the road the individuals who make up a ruling class follow is made up of an infinitude of minor acts. So it is not a question of a system merely; the individual's acts play a role too. But, he goes on to say, when the individual members of a ruling group fan economic conflicts, pile up armaments, and whip up patriotic sentiments, it does not mean that wars are being deliberately plotted. Economic conflicts, he assures us, are fanned and armaments built for the sake of immediate profit. And whipping up patriotism is

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

merely a governing device. So far from wanting a war, ruling groups may even deem a war bad from a business standpoint. When war does come, this is not because the ruling group wanted it; rather is it the end product of a vast number of particular acts on the part of the members of the ruling group, none of which acts expressed an intent to make war.

Pareto's fallacy is like that of the aforementioned professor whom I heard say that business men steal not because they are dishonest but because the system compels them to. It did not occur to him to inquire whether truly honest men would tolerate a scheme of things that impels them to theft. It does not occur to Pareto that if a ruling group tolerates a system that impels toward exploitation, toward competition, toward deception, toward war, that is clear evidence that the group does not consider these activities undesirable. And those who engage in activities that they know are extremely likely to eventuate in war, must be considered as not averse to it, even though they may not clearly and definitely intend it.

I cannot visualize a war that nobody intends. Such a war can transpire in fairy-tales only.

The principle may be laid down that those who perform acts that are known to conduce to a

## *An Interpretation of History*

specific result are not averse to the latter. Those who are guilty of deeds that have repeatedly led to social chaos, who adhere to ways of life and social institutions that conduce to social disaster, and who even close their minds to the criticism of these deeds and ways of life and institutions as socially destructive, cannot be regarded as keenly opposed to the generation of the evils involved.

### SOCIOLOGICAL RELATIVISM

A way of thinking that will have to undergo some qualification is that sociological relativism, according to which the ways of life and the social institutions of every period and every people are suited to the needs of the time and place. This is indeed a delightfully idyllic conception. Happy have been the people of all times, living under institutions so delicately attuned to their wants and desires!

The trouble with the sociological relativist is this, that when he speaks of ways of life and of social institutions as suited to the needs of a place and time, he is not careful enough to inquire as to exactly whose needs it is sought to satisfy. Perhaps he takes it for granted that the answer is, everybody's needs. Since, however, the bulk of



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

the physically adult population at any given time and place, ruling groups included, has been composed of psychologically immature individuals, it would seem that human needs have been consistently disregarded. And so they have. As has just been noted, social systems have nowhere been designed expressly for the task of helping men and women acquire intellectual, emotional and volitional maturity. Human society having always subsisted on the exploitative, competitive, and autocratic level, social systems and ways of life have been largely, if not chiefly, instruments employed by a few for the acquisition of power and material wealth.

Here is a criterion by means of which it now becomes possible to appraise the mores and institutions of any time and place. Always the question to be asked is: do they or do they not facilitate the maturation of human personalities?

Have, then, exploitation, competition and autocracy ever possessed a positive growth value, as far as human intellect, emotion and will are concerned? There is no evidence that they have, and the evidence seems conclusive that they have not. Has there never been any need, then, for autocracy of any kind? Well, if autocracy is a hindrance to the psychological maturation of both the ruler

## *An Interpretation of History*

and the ruled, they sound ridiculous who say that at any point in history this or that people needed autocracy or dictatorship. They seem to be saying that the individuals who composed this or that people needed to have their psychological growth arrested.

This is as good a place as any to deal with the stock argument in favor of autocracy and dictatorship as necessary for the maintenance of order. The answer to that argument is this, that when order is maintained by sacrificing the growth of human personalities, it becomes meaningless and defeats its own ostensible object. Order has maximal value when it facilitates the maximal growth of all persons inhabiting a given area at a given time. When order fails to provide for more than a scanty growth on the part of the majority, it leads to degeneration and disorder. Autocracies and dictatorships, when not overthrown, finally issue in these.

Using the mode of interpretation recommended in this chapter, it will be asserted that the autocrat and the dictator are primarily interested in the gratification of their power-cravings, and it is for this reason that they select political absolutism as a means for the establishment of order. No one has any right to expect any other line of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

conduct from rulers who live on the immature level. Furthermore, political absolutism has usually received the sanction of ruling economic, ecclesiastical and military groups, and this for reasons too obvious to mention.

### SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT AND LEVELS OF LIFE

Another consequence of the thesis propounded in this book is this, that it enables us to dispose of the habit of viewing divergent schools of thought in any field as nothing more than so many different ways of seeing the world or any aspect thereof. This viewpoint places all schools of thought, all scales of value, all philosophies, on the same level. It proceeds on the assumption that all schools of thought have their generation in mature minds. There seems to be no warrant for such an assumption.

Two divergent schools of thought or scales of value or philosophies may, in any given case, be representative of two levels of thought and behavior: one the psychologically immature, exploitative, competitive, autocratic, paranoid; the other, the psychologically mature, democratic, co-operative, rational. Of any two diverse standpoints it may of course be true that they belong

## *An Interpretation of History*

on the same level — and the level may be that of psychological maturity or immaturity. But very often the conflict between two ways of interpreting anything, or between two scales of value, is a struggle between these two levels on which human life subsists. Obviously, social philosophies that advocate exploitation, competition and autocracy do not luxuriate on the same level on which are generated the philosophies that place a higher value on democracy and co-operation. It is furthermore a question whether, for instance, Buddhism subsists on the same level as Judaism, Hegelian idealism with pragmatism, the philosophy of Nietzsche with that of Dewey, Roman Catholicism with Unitarianism.

None of this should be taken as a justification of intolerance and the suppression of thought. As is being pointed out in another portion of the book, such intolerance is itself an expression of psychological immaturity. Wherever maturity meets immaturity, its response ought to be of a character that will facilitate growth on both sides of the line, its side as well as the other. Immaturity cannot be successfully dealt with by methods that are themselves immature. It can be neutralized only by the provision of ways of life and patterns of behavior that facilitate maturation.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### A NEW CRITERION OF GREATNESS

The thesis that is being worked out in this book now makes possible a new criterion of personal greatness. No man or woman can be termed great who is not intellectually, emotionally or volitionally mature. No one can be considered great whose contribution does not facilitate the acquisition of maturity by other personalities. No one deserves to be placed in the company of the great whose growth requires the denial of growth to an entire community or group or class or nation, or humanity itself. It is easy to see that, judged by this standard, quite a number of historical personages, hitherto esteemed as great, will have to be demoted to the rank of the little. Or, if they are kept in the ranks of the great, it will be necessary to create two categories or levels of greatness. That is to say, it will be necessary to distinguish between big great men and women on the one hand and little great men and women on the other.

No predatory individual, no exploiter, no autocrat can be rated truly great, unless — but this is to anticipate. No one who is psychologically immature and who subsists on the exploitative, competitive or autocratic level can be classified as great,



## *An Interpretation of History*

be he ever so prominent, ever so energetic, and be the space he fills on the pages of history ever so large. This means, then, that very few of the economic, political, ecclesiastical and military leaders of the past and present are entitled to a place in the company of the great. It means that a very large proportion of those whom historians have labeled great will have to undergo the demotion they deserve. It means, to cite examples, that Alexander the Great and Frederick the Great and Peter the Great become Alexander the Little and Frederick the Little and Peter the Little. Alexander and Frederick still remain great soldiers; but that is not the same thing as saying they were great men. I am not to be understood as saying that there has never been a great captain of industry, a great politician, a great soldier, a great churchman, a great prize-fighter, or a great jockey. One can be great in any profession and still not be a great man or woman. One may be a great exploiter, a great autocrat, a great dictator; but he who is great along these lines is not necessarily great as a man. The truly great person is one who makes a mighty contribution to the store of cultural values — the most precious values there are. That is, he is great who adds mightily to art, religion, science, philosophy or ethical living — ethical

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

being the name for conduct that facilitates the fuller growth of human beings. An exploiter or a despot who should compensate society by adding greatly to these would be entitled to rank among the great.

Much has been said concerning the great man theory of history. A good deal of history, however, is better understood in terms of a little man theory. History has been what it was because not only the masses but the greater portion of their leaders have been little men, or at best little great men — great men on a low level, the level of exploitation, competition and autocracy. This is why history is before all else a tale of blackness and brutality and bankruptcy and failure. History is primarily the record of the manner in which human beings have kept each other from growing. It is the story of the pathetic efforts of men to attain growth by means of devices which remove the very condition of growth. What a pathetic thing is history! What a long, bleak procession of countless millions upon millions of men and women, the overwhelming majority of whom never attained manhood and womanhood!

Almost always, however, there has been present a saving minority, a minority composed of the psychologically mature men and women. From

## *An Interpretation of History*

this minority have come the creators and maintainers of culture, the begetters and sustainers of civilization, the champions of life's most precious values. From this minority have come most of the truly great, the big great men and women — the ethical, intellectual and artistic heroes of the race.

## CHAPTER XI

### SLAVES AND DICTATORS

#### A NOTE ON PLATO AND FICHTE

IT is an amazingly acute insight into human nature that leads Plato to the hypothesis, offered in the *Statesman*, that it is among slaves that a king will find his rivals. The thought surprised Plato himself; the idea that servants should aspire to rule strikes him as strange, yet he assures himself that he is not dreaming when he beholds the slave claiming possession of political science. It is patent that Plato perceived in slaves a yearning for power over human beings, and a rationalization thereof by means of a spurious claim to the possession of a knowledge of the science of government. Can it be that Plato also discerned the slavish-mindedness of tyrants? Did he appraise the king as a slave become ruler, as an individual whose sway over others was a defence against his feared submersion by them? The text indicates no such conception of the ruler.

## *Slaves and Dictators*

The slave seeks to rule. What Plato perceived, Fichte affirms in *The Vocation of the Scholar*. A truly free man, says Fichte, desires to see around him similar beings, that is, free beings. Hence he who surrounds himself with slaves is slavish himself. This, asserts Fichte, is proved by the fact that the enslaver himself will cringe before the first stronger man who subdues him.

The truly free man wishes to be surrounded by free men because, thinks Fichte, his ethic is an ethic of mutuality. He aims at social relationships of the most harmonious character. These require that his neighbors shall be with respect to their social status as like himself as possible. He can establish give and take relationships with free men more easily than with slaves.

The truly free man, Fichte points out, will not even use human beings as means for the attainment of the ends of their own being. Even if it were not an impossible task, he would not make anyone happy, virtuous or wise against his own will.

Rightly does Fichte say that the exploitation of human beings and the violation of their wills balk the progress of society toward its destiny — the attainment of the greatest possible degree of social unity. A requisite of this progress is the



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

mutual influence of the most perfectly developed free and rational individuals. A society of slaves and enslavers, or what amounts to the same thing, a society of slaves, is therefore a contradiction. It negates itself; it destroys its destiny.

This is the truth that Fichte holds out for our consideration. A society of slaves negates itself; the enslaver negates himself. A community of slaves is a community of less than humans; it is a society, not of men, but of useful animals; not of members, but of tools; not of fellow-workmen, but of enslaved and passive instruments. Such a society balks its destiny and negates itself — as long as it is what it is, it is not a harmonious union of individuals in process of harmonious growth. The ruler of men negates himself. He works in opposition to himself. To the extent that he subjects others, he fixates himself on a slavish level: he deprives himself of the educative influence of a society of rational freemen. Thus speaks Fichte.

## CHAPTER XII

### SEX PATRIOTISM

SEX patriotism is an attitude toward one's own sex essentially similar to that of a national or racial patriot to his country or race. Practically everyone is a sex patriot.

Except among neurotics, sex patriotism does not exist in an aggravated form. This is probably true of all forms of patriotism. Your fanatic patriot of any kind is always, I suspect, a case for the neurologist, the psychoanalyst, or the endocrinologist. In fact the fanatic patriot is not primarily a patriot, anyway. He is first and foremost an egregious narcissist, and his greatest and most passionate love is himself.

At any rate, sex patriotism is as a rule not in the foreground of consciousness to the extent that racial, national and class patriotisms are. It may be well that this is so, but there is at least one reason why this is unfortunate. Because sex patriotism is in the background of our consciousnesses, because we pay little or no attention to it, it can

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

and does influence our conduct and our thought, and without our taking due note of that fact, or doing anything to neutralize it. An unconscious prejudice is a dangerous prejudice. A bias brought to rest in the very focal center of consciousness is a bias that one can handle, one can deal with, one can conquer, one can make allowance for. But these prejudices that rarely, if ever, get to the main floor, these biases that flit about in the backyards and sub-cellars of one's mind: these are the ones that are in the long run perhaps more dangerous than the other kind.

But though sex patriotism operate in back of the head, its manifestations and its products are constantly visible out in front. Sex patriotism can even be seen projecting itself into the very tissue of history. Indeed, it has been so continuous and so ubiquitous in its operations that to it can hardly be denied the status of one of the major forces in the shaping of history. It has in all likelihood been the chief factor in the establishment and perpetuation of every androcracy and every gynocracy that ever was.

### THE ROOTS OF ANDROCRACY AND GYNOCRACY

It is hard to say what adjective best characterizes those explanations of gynocracy and andro-

## *Sex Patriotism*

cracy which attribute them solely or primarily to the operation of economic forces, or in the case of androcracy to masculine physical superiority, or in the case of gynocracy, to popular appreciation of the importance of the feminine in the biological economy. Some such adjective as comic, unrealistic or absurd they most certainly deserve. The economic determinists are comic when they ascribe the rise of androcracy to this or that set of economic institutions. Frazer is simply inadequate when he explains gynocracy as having its genesis in popular perception of the importance of the feminine in the biological economy. And men have not ruled because they have been physically stronger, or because they have supported their wives, or because they have fought in the wars. All of these explanations of man-rule and woman-rule are evasions — the output of minds that cannot or will not see the truth even when it bulks before them.

How in the world could economic institutions, or physical superiority, or economic superiority, or military superiority, or the playing of an important role in the biological economy, have placed either sex in the position of ruler over the other, except there were in the first instance and before all else a wish, a longing, a yearning to exercise

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

such rule? Why, given a world in which men support their wives, and fight the wars, should women be denied the right to the fullest participation in governmental affairs except because men want to enjoy the exercise of power over women? And when women suggest that now that forty-eight or fifty-two, or whatever per cent of property is in their hands, we ought to go in for gynocracy, what is it that animates them except an appetite of a certain sort?

I am not very greatly impressed by all this talk about the dependence of autocracy and democracy upon economic institutions, military arrangements, biological superiorities and inferiorities, and what not. No economic or military or biological arrangement has ever been, or ever will be, or ever can be responsible for an autocracy of any kind whatsoever. The ultimate factor behind every autocracy is a set of immature attitudes, feelings and yearnings. Every autocracy is primarily an immaturity, not an economic, nor military, nor biological, phenomenon.

Economic, biological or military arrangements are seized upon by the psychologically immature as opportunities, occasions, and excuses for the exercise of power over others. Social institutions



## *Sex Patriotism*

do not cause any set of human beings against their will to exercise sovereignty over others.

To those who are inclined to doubt the truth of my remarks, I would suggest a simple and inexpensive little experiment. I suggest an interview with a male advocate of androcracy or female champion of gynocracy at some time when said advocate or champion is in a candid mood. And, if one can catch him or her off guard, the result will repay the trouble — the real, not the fancied reason, for wanting an androcratic or gynocratic arrangement comes blurting out.

Sex patriotism, like every other form of patriotism, is a form of egotism. Egotism explains more history than economics or religion or ideas do. An egotistic interpretation of history would indeed be a one-sided, inadequate doctrine, but it would, I suspect, explain more than a philosophy of history in terms of economic processes, political institutions, religious movements or ideological changes — in combination with these it should explain pretty nearly everything. It would then go pretty far in explaining the fact, nature, behavior and caprices of every form of autocracy that ever was.

Yes, to sex egotism or sex patriotism, responsible as it is for the dominance of sex over sex, with

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

all the consequences thereof, must certainly be conceded a large place in history. Yet the extraordinary fact is that it has received little or no attention, even from social psychologists.

### THE ATTITUDE OF THE SEXES TO EACH OTHER

Much, very much, has been said concerning racial patriotism. Oceans of words have been uttered anent nationalism and national patriotism. Volumes have been spoken about religious and denominational pride. And today class patriotism is a popular subject of discourse. But very little has been said about this kind of patriotism, one that is as old and as ubiquitous as any.

There is such a thing as sex patriotism, a feeling toward one's own sex essentially like that towards one's race, country, class or religion. Now, there is no patriotism, no intense group feeling, without a correlative fear of, and hostility to, other and opposed groups. Groups compete for power, and this competition generates all the sentiments and emotions that attend the conflict of crowds. Every man and every woman is something of a sex patriot. Probably every man is therefore more or less of a misogynist. Certainly,

few men are free from a greater or lesser degree of fear of, and contempt for, women, a fear and contempt that are in part response to feminine ways and traits, and in part outgrowths of superiority and inferiority feelings.

But the misogyny of men hardly compares with the corresponding attitude of women toward the masculine sex. For men, very many women have a deep and abiding contempt. Contempt is never far from hatred. From a profound contempt it is but a fraction of a step to hatred. Feminine hostility to men does not generally take the form of hatred. But quite a number of women step over the boundary and exhibit an androphobia in greater or lesser degree. Androphobia is an apt name for it — hatred and fear are usually correlated and the term *phobia* symbolizes the union of the two.

This phobia is in part response to masculine ways and traits, and in part an outgrowth of superiority and inferiority feelings. And while note has been made by many of men's fear of women, strangely little has been said concerning women's fear of men. This should not be, for fear tends to vary directly as its correlated hatred, and women's fear of men must therefore be a greater thing than men's fear of women. Very few men

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

are really strong misogynists. There is not much hatred of women among men — which means that popular writers exaggerate the masculine fear of women. Where there is little hatred, there fear is slight. Where hatred is great, the fear is correspondingly great. And feminine contempt of men is very often great, and this contempt often crosses over into hatred.

But there it is, this fact of women's rather widespread and persistent contempt for the male. It is a pathetic fact, and its neglect by writers, ethicists, psychologists and sociologists is itself a pathetic fact. The omission is particularly unfortunate in the case of those prophets who allot an immense altruistic role to the women of the immediate future. These prophets speak in ignorance of the real woman; they give expression to their fiction of woman as a vast maternal force that yearns only to create good. But how much altruism may be expected from those whose souls are seared by a profound contempt, and often hatred, for one half the human race?

There is no doubt about it — the mutual hostility of the sexes is a fact. It is a hostility so ancient and so ubiquitous that almost everyone accepts it as he accepts the mores, customs and institutions of his community. As a result, almost

## *Sex Patriotism*

no one does anything about it except coin jokes. But the harm it does is incalculable. Man's hostility to woman has in all countries, and no one knows how many centuries, thwarted her growth in every direction. To paraphrase a famous saying, man's inhumanity to women makes countless thousands of women mourn.

### THE COSMIC PHANTASY

A group that strives for dominion will sustain its spirit and rationalize its quest by means of what I call the cosmic phantasy. The cosmic phantasy is a species of pseudo-philosophy. It represents an attempt to depict the universe as so constituted as to assure the ultimate ascendance to power of one's group. It is an endeavor to show that the rule of one's crowd is made inevitable by the very nature of things. The world is from all time fated to come under the dominion of one's group. Inexorable forces prepare the way and make victory certain. "The stars in their courses fight for us."

The literature of every militant crowd is a study in this type of megalomania, disguised as science and philosophy. Every such crowd has its "scientists" and "philosophers" whose bounden



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

duty it is to make the mythology of the group appear something other than it is. It is the business of these individuals to take certain conclusions and to discover for them the proper "facts" and the appropriate premises by means of which the "truth" of the conclusions can be established.

Myths can function powerfully as drives to action, but only when made to dissemble the truth.

Masculine and feminine sex patriots both have their cosmic phantasies, their pseudo-philosophies, their *Weltanschauungen*.

The masculine phantasy is familiar. The male is born to rule. The male is more aggressive than the female. He exceeds her in intelligence and in creative activity. He is physically the stronger. He supports and protects the woman and the offspring. God himself is a male deity, the archangels are male, most of the saints, prophets and apostles are male. Most of the great in every line of endeavor have been men. Clearly, God and nature intend that the male shall dominate. Paul, in the Epistles, explicitly proclaims this dominion.

The feminine cosmic phantasy has it that the androcracy under which the world has for so long a time been living is destined to be replaced by a gynocracy. The more impatient of the feminine sex patriots announce that the gynocracy is already

under way. The most impatient of them say it is already here.

According to the feminine phantasy, nature has all along intended women to rule. Androcracy is a usurpation, invented and set up by an inferior sex which refuses to accept its place. Women are the born rulers. They are the conservers and transmitters of life. Their maternal nature makes them the great altruists. Theirs is a genuine scale of values. They are the guardians of home, hearth, health and happiness. They are the wiser, more realistic and more practical sex. They are pressing forward in every field of endeavor hitherto closed to them, they are acquiring property, they are capturing political offices — so that gynocracy is written in the stars. Speaking of the stars, the earliest deities, or some of them, were feminine — Cybele, Isis, Ishtar — so there you are.

It is clear to the feminine sex patriot that woman is the natural and predestined ruler.

It is clear to the masculine sex patriot that man is the natural and predestined ruler.

It is clear to me that both the masculine and feminine sex patriots ought naturally be destined to undergo a thorough psychological analysis and course of treatment.

Alongside, or as part of the pseudo-philosophy

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

of sex patriotism, one discovers a pseudo-sociology. The pseudo-sociology of sex patriotism, like that of every militant group, is an "interpretation" of history in terms of the familiar hero and villain, or devil and saint mythology. The world is divided into two groups or classes, only one of which possesses humane feelings, a social vision, and a genius for government. The other group possesses a singular capacity for breeding evil. Whether the world contains a preponderance of good or evil depends on whether the people with the governmental genius govern or are governed.

Hence the formula of the feminine sex patriot: the evils of this world are traceable to its androcracy. Men have made the world what it is, and what a world it is! Particularly are men responsible for poverty and war and exploitation and autocracy and the sordidness that is apparent everywhere.

This feminist pseudo-sociology at its best — or at its worst — the best sophism is also the worst — exhibits a bit of intellectual shuffling. When a sex-patriotic woman wants to explain the evils of this world, she ascribes it to the fact that men have been its rulers. When, however, whatever good the world contains is to be accounted for, the world becomes a place that has always been ruled

## *Sex Patriotism*

by its mothers. This is the point in the argument at which the female sex patriot usually pronounces the formula, "The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." The world, then, is under the sovereignty of men when its evils are to be accounted for, and it is under the rule of women when its good things have to be explained. It is really extraordinary how women can go on in this way without being suspected either by themselves or any one else.

The feminist pseudo-sociology is not a bit worse than the masculine of the species. We will make its acquaintance in the following chapter, where we will discover it to consist, in part, of the performance of sophistic tricks with the word "superiority." The tricks in question result in a fantastic view of the function of the male in the social economy and of his relation to the female.

### THE SEX-PATRIOT'S DREAM-WORLD

The unfortunate consequence of all this false philosophizing and false "sociologizing" is the creation of unreal, fantastic worlds, in which some men and women pass whole lives, their minds unchastened by contact with things as they are. In this world of men and women, there are men who try to live as if women were not a force to be

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

reckoned with, and there are women who seek to live as if men constituted an alien element in the universe. The result of the spinning of cosmic phantasies is the emergence of a kind of exclusiveness and sex snobbery, such as that of the fascist who excludes women from public life, and that of the feminine sex patriot who envisages a gynarchy, a world in which all problems are solved by women, and all culture created by them, with or without an occasional minor contribution from the male side of the world. These dreams sometimes take an astonishing form. Some time ago a group of feminists, certain of the coming of a gynarchy, held a meeting to take up the serious question of the precise status of men under such a regime. At this meeting, one of them prophesied that with the discovery that they were really inferior to their feminine rivals, male artists, scientists, and philosophers would flee from their respective fields, for, she assured her audience, men can work in them for only as long as they can feel themselves superior to their feminine colleagues. That is to say, Einstein, Eddington, Russell, Santayana, Dewey, Freud, Thomas Mann, Masfield and Sibelius, as well as men of lesser stature, can continue their labors only while they believe themselves abler than women. Let it once become ap-



## *Sex Patriotism*

parent to them that abler they are not, and their interest in art and science and philosophy will disappear.

Such is the stuff dreams are made of.

I do not wish to be unfair and press indictments where none are called for. Many a woman who gives expression to ideas such as those just described speaks partly in jest — in a spirit half-jocose. But a phantasy may not be less significant because it occurs in the form of a joke. The fact that such jokes abound is significant for the state of mind of a society and its women. At all events, it is significant that so much of feminine energy is spent in invidious comparisons of the sexes, in visions of a woman-led world, and in the organization of all kinds of activities from which men are excluded. Some of these activities are undoubtedly useful, but many of them may represent nothing more than an attempt to realize an unhealthy sort of a dream.

### MASCULINE TOTALITARIANISM

And as for masculinism, it has for centuries, in its attempt to act out the male dream of superiority to women in all things, imposed on almost the entire world a sterilizing and paralyzing totalitarianism. Androcracy is totalitarianism in one of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

its worst forms. Under the guise of protection, but really in order to gratify the masculine yearning for dominion over women, it imposes upon womanhood conditions that make it difficult or impossible for a woman to acquire that degree of self-direction necessary to the acquisition of a mature self. Concerning the chivalry of some androcratic societies, let it be noted that it is androcracy which creates the need for chivalry. It weakens women, and then it "gallantly" undertakes to protect them. This is the essential fraud of chivalry in its relation to women, that chivalry about which so much romantic rot has been written. The unconscious intention behind chivalry is the creation of a woman weak enough to make masculine sovereignty over her an apparent necessity.

There is no calculating the terrible and enormous damage, human damage, that androcracy has wrought upon the world, and the feminine half of it in particular — the stunting of feminine personality, the inhibition of feminine talent and genius, — the generation of intersexual hates, fears and contempts, the fostering of sadisms and masochisms on both sides of the line, and last, but not least, the damage done to the masculine half of the race in depriving itself of the stimulus and inspiration of a womanhood grown to full stature.

## CHAPTER XIII

### MASCULINIST DELUSIONS

MR. BEVERLEY NICHOLS has written a delightful and entertaining book, *Women and Children Last*. It is a book that is full of clever remarks, a substantially large number of them worth making. It is the kind of book in which thoughts, epigrams, aphorisms, generalizations and what not are thrown about with the abandon of a boy throwing pebbles on the beach. It is one of those books in which the writer races from thought to thought at such breakneck speed that he does not have time to think.

Mr. Nichols, at one point in his book, says that the husband ought to dominate over the wife. This, he says, is justified by the masochism, which is, he gives us his word for it, deeply rooted in the feminine mind, and by the sadism that, he asserts, is equally natural to the male. Women like to be under their husbands' domination, and they cling to those men who strive to please themselves. Where husbands rule, everybody is infinitely bet-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

ter off, particularly the women. Unfortunately, wails Mr. Nichols, in the modern world, it is wives who rule. Nichols is so busy scurrying from one thought to the next that it does not occur to him to inquire whether it is really so. At any rate, he does not seem to think it necessary to prove that it is so, beyond saying that he once saw a man kneeling on the floor in the lounge of a restaurant, doing up his wife's shoe, that there are homes in which the wife determines the color of the dining room, reclines on a divan, and lives to please herself, and that he has witnessed quarrels in which as often as not it was the woman's fist which was clenched while the man's shrank timidly. If he had stopped to look at his sentence, he would have been struck by its implication. He has implied by his statement that as often as not, the husband's hand does not shrink timidly.

### MASCULINIST MUMMERY

Let us look into the masculinist mummery of Beverley Nichols. For there is, of course, a masculinist mummery, as there is a feminist mummery.

It is sheer presumptuousness to assert that sadism is properly male and masochism female — unless one can furnish good biological or psycho-

## *Masculinist Delusions*

logical grounds for saying so, which Nichols does not. There is evidence, such as that contained in the Vaertings' *The Dominant Sex*, which suggests that in gynocracies women have been sadists, and men masochists. It may be that whether men or women will be sadistic or masochistic depends on which sex enjoys the role of dominance. Feminine masochism may very well be the product of patriarchal families and an androcratic society.

The statement that everybody, particularly women, is infinitely better off when the husband rules, is simply false. Everybody, as a rule, is badly off, particularly the husband. Not even a masochistic wife wants her husband to please only himself. Nichols himself refers to American divorce statistics. Does he suppose that American wives divorce their husbands for failing to please only themselves, the husbands?

The effects of husband-dominance are essentially the same, and essentially as bad, as those of wifely dominance. The destruction of a woman's will is as tragic and disastrous an affair as the destruction of a man's. Its effects are precisely as morbid, and it is just as truly destructive of affection. In the one case as in the other, mutual affection is metamorphosed into reciprocal detestation, fear and contempt. Further, the domin-



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

ant husband, like the dominant wife, stands in danger of acquiring a stunted will. For the fact of the matter appears to be that strength of will requires for its growth that one shall live in the presence of strong-willed persons. One does not grow strong in the presence of weaklings. A successful marriage is a school for the education of wills, not a device for their annihilation. The person who breaks the will of his mate removes an essential condition of the education of his own.

### DOMESTIC AUTOCRACY

This is as good a place as any in which to deal with the attempt to justify the rule of either married partner over the other on the ground that it is required in the interest of domestic efficiency and unity.

The efficiency argument is easily disposed of. Domestic efficiency is, of course, a thing to be highly prized. But efficiency is never a value of the first order. It is always merely a means, never an end — or rather, it should never be an end. Life is not lived in order to be efficient. And a home is not primarily a factory or a warehouse or a department store; it is primarily a place where love and will and mind should prosper and grow.

## *Masculinist Delusions*

Now domestic autocracy is usually fatal to all three. The domestic autocrat stunts the growth of every member of the family, including himself or herself — one is more likely to grow to full strength and maturity in the presence of those who are enjoying growth themselves. Further, the domestic autocrat causes love to metamorphose into fear, contempt, detestation and hatred — except when he or she is dealing with a pathologically masochistic partner, and sometimes even then. The domestic autocrat makes extraordinarily difficult the volitional and intellectual growth of every member of the family, for the reason that he or she refuses to grant the minds and wills of his or her filial associates much opportunity for exercise. Add to all this the revelations of the Adlerian school of psychologists concerning the genesis of neuroses in filial autocracy, and we are in a better position to estimate the value of the efficiency that goes with that kind of autocracy. It is an efficiency of a spurious character, like the efficiency of most “practical” people — it destroys values vastly more important than those it fosters.

Equally spurious is the “unity” achieved by filial autocracy. This “unity” is not in the least genuine. Unity cannot be spoken of where one will annihilates another. One then has subtraction,

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

not union. Unity has not been attained where two live wills are replaced by one live and one dead will. There is then nothing to unite.

To have genuine unity it is essential that two or more wills voluntarily associate themselves in pursuit of a common and freely chosen goal. Unity is then real, first, because there is something to unite, and second, because all wills are orientated with reference to the same goal and are infused with the same spirit. Real unity is always oriented with reference to a task or a goal, never with reference to a person conceived as ruler. When the latter is the case, we have annihilation and subtraction, not union. The "unity" imposed by an autocrat of any type — domestic, political, industrial, ecclesiastical, or military, is always spurious. For then there is, not a union, but a destruction of wills.

One more word. Those who have been in homes where husband or wife enjoys a more than mild sovereignty must have noted how heavily the atmosphere is charged with morbidity. There is something in the atmosphere of such a home that sickens and repels, something as difficult to describe as a bad odor or the taste of bad food. Such a home may be a model of administrative effi-

## *Masculinist Delusions*

ciency; but it also furnishes model cases for psychoanalytic treatment.

All of this is written for the edification of people like Beverley Nichols, who think that everybody is well off when husbands rule, and for those others who love to prate of the benefits of wifely rule.

### ANDROCRATIC SOPHISTRY

The "justification" of an androcratic social order does no credit to masculine intelligence. It always involves slipshod thinking. Its logic is vicious. Its sophism lies in the performance of a certain trick with the word *superiority*. The trick lies in giving the word a certain ambiguity. Or, what amounts to the same thing, when the word has been given a certain meaning, another meaning is surreptitiously smuggled into it. Thus, it having been established that they possess physical superiority in the sense of muscular strength, men esteem themselves better fitted to rule. Similarly, they hold that their superior ruling capacity is established by the fact that in war, the burden of actual fighting falls on them, that is, by the fact of their military superiority. Until recently it was held that the male was economically superior, and hence possessed of better governing capacity.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

Each of these arguments exhibits the same awful logic. In each there is an absolutely unwarranted inference. In each there is to be found an illegitimate extension of the meaning of the term "superiority." Thus, physical, military or economic superiority is stretched to include within its comprehension political or governing superiority.

Now there is no reason whatsoever to suppose that physical, military or economic superiority is necessarily and always correlated with that of a political or governing kind. On the contrary, a person may be physically strong, or a good soldier, or an excellent business man, and yet possess little or no political capacity. This is indeed very often the case. The attempt to associate, in argument, political superiority with physical, military or economic supremacy is a surreptitious manoeuvre designed to conceal the lack of any necessary connection between them.

It is well to bear in mind that superiority in a given direction does not always and necessarily connote superiority in other directions.

Intellectual superiority and the alleged logicity of men are frequently cited as good and sufficient reasons for androcracy. But good and



## *Masculinist Delusions*

sufficient reasons they are not. The logicality of men is largely fiction. This can be proven by observation. The thought of most men is emotionally-conditioned. It consists of an incoherent mass of rationalizations. Being a student of ways of thinking, I have observed the ways that men employ, and I have been struck by the fact that most of those I meet exhibit thinking that is shot through and through with fallacy, sophism and irrelevancy. I find it just about as difficult to induce my male respondents to converse logically on a subject about which they feel strongly as I do women. I perceive among the generality of men, as I do among the generality of women, the same failure to think thoughts through. The delusion of infallibility is just as strong and just as widely prevalent among men as among women. And it is worthy of note that the generality of men are as illogical and as emotional in their thinking about political, economic and social affairs as the generality of women. Are men better fitted to govern than women?

Of course men with a scientific or philosophical education think better than their less educated brothers — or sisters. But it is also true that women of similar education think better than their sisters — or brothers.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

The question of masculine intellectual superiority is really irrelevant, for even if this superiority be granted, it does not justify an androcratic constitution of society. Society exists for women as well as men; it is pure arrogance for men to speak of any nation as a man's country, or of the world as a man's world. Feminine personalities require growth and development just as masculine personalities do, and women, as a rule, know their own needs and desires better than men. Hence, if this world is to be made a better place for all to live in, women must share in its government. Besides, women, like men, cannot enjoy life in a world in the creation and government of which they have no share. They no more want men to bring them a more perfect world on a golden platter than men want women to do that for them. Each of us, men and women, feels that if there is to be a better world, he will enjoy living in it all the more if he has had a share in making it real. Unless this condition be met, a better world will be little more than a symbol of humiliation.

If it is true that women are preponderantly masochistic, and men preponderantly sadistic, this is not an argument in favor of androcracy. It may very well be an argument against it. For it is just possible that this condition is itself a product

## *Masculinist Delusions*

of androcracy. Under the latter, boys learn to play a dominant role, and girls a submissive one.

There is, however, no doubt about the corrosive influence that androcracy exerts on the attitude of the sexes to each other. And the corrosion affects men as well as women. Our androcracy makes for mutual fear and mutual contempt. A subject womanhood fears and contemns the ruling sex. And the ruling sex, in its turn, cannot help but entertain some contempt for the sex regarded as politically inferior. Nor can a ruling sex avoid fear of the subject sex, for the latter is always at least a potential rebel, and often an actual one.

The most dangerous, the most pathetic of masculinist illusions is the notion that the growth and development of men require the cribbing and confining of women. The exact opposite is the case. For it seems to be true of the sexes, as it seems to be true of individuals and societies, that the fuller growth of the one is conditioned by, and is the condition of, the fuller growth of the other. True enough, most women will find the place where they can enjoy the fullest development to be the home. But it is essential for the growth of a woman's personality that she possess the right to determine whether her career will be in or out

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

of the home. Conscript wives and conscript mothers acquire the personality of a conscript. Finally, the contributions that women outside the home are making to culture and to social progress enrich the lives of all, men included. Men deal a terrible blow to their own development when they make difficult or impossible the emergence of a Jane Addams, a Florence Nightingale, a Montessori, a Madame Curie, an Edna St. Vincent Millay.

### THE FAMILY AS A BULWARK OF AUTOCRACY

Although in the last three hundred years so much has been said and written concerning democracy—political, industrial, ecclesiastical, racial—and although so much has been done to achieve some degree of each of these, almost nothing, relatively speaking, has been said or done about the democratization of the family! An extraordinary fact, when one considers, first, that the family is so notoriously run on autocratic lines, and second, that the family is everybody's first school. It is a commentary on the slight grasp of psychology of so many of the champions of democracy that they have never thought it important to democratize the first and perhaps the greatest of all schools. They have instead pre-

## *Masculinist Delusions*

ferred to entertain the simplist notion that the democratization of the human spirit requires nothing more than the alteration of the political or the economic institutions of society. The imposition of a democratic form upon these institutions has been considered sufficient to evoke democratic responses from men and women, even if they did spend all their lives in the autocratic environment of the home. The environment outside the home is all that matters. The environment within the home somehow does not.

At any rate, the family remains to this very day a great bulwark of autocracy. There are democratic families, of course. But in too many instances families are dictatorships. And of the democrats who bewail the fate of Italy, Russia and Germany, very few will be found to deplore the millions of little dictatorships to be found in the apartments, mansions and cottages the world over. Now why is that?

Part of the answer is this. Far too many democrats possess a vested interest in domestic autocracy. Far too many of them either are or hope to be filial autocrats themselves! Far too many of them believe in democracy outside the home, and autocracy inside it — provided they can be the autocrats.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

And part of the answer is this. The tyranny of an absolute monarch, of a political dictator, of an industrial magnate, or of a pope, is a tyranny on a scale great enough to carry an obvious dramatic appeal. Also, it surrounds itself with pomp. Also, it often involves the shedding of blood. And further, its removal may be economically valuable to someone.

Yet it is futile to work for a democratic state and a democratic industry and a democratic church, and permit autocracy to luxuriate in the one institution the influence of which upon the life of every person is perhaps exceeded by no other. There is no sense in protecting human personality against extra-filial exploitation only to expose it to degradation at the hands of a domestic despot.

## CHAPTER XIV

### A PROGRAM

PARADOXICAL as the statement may appear, it is nevertheless true that all that has been said concerning the psychological immaturity of most men and women leads to an optimistic conclusion. For if the generality of men and women has hitherto been predominantly immature psychologically, then a good deal of the ground is cut from under the pessimistic fears for the future. And the reason is this: *One cannot legitimately argue from the limitations of the immature to the capabilities of the mature.* From the failure of the psychologically immature people of the past and present to solve certain problems and eliminate or assuage certain evils no inference can be made to the inability of psychologically maturer persons to accomplish these things. The achievements of the few mature persons in the past and present have been remarkable. These achievements in the creation, appreciation and utilization of cultural values furnish an index of human potentialities.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

In *The Meaning of History* Berdyaev says that man's historical experience has been one of steady failure; that there are no grounds for supposing it will ever be anything else; that none of the problems of any given historical epoch have been solved, no aims have been attained, no hopes realized.

What is Berdyaev doing? He is arguing from the limitations of the arrested men and women of the past and present to the capacities of men and women of the future. He mistakes the limitations of the psychologically immature for a law governing human capacity.

Berdyaev anyhow does not speak truly when he describes the past as a record of steady failure, unsolved problems and unattained aims. History records, among other things, the growth of civilizations, the establishment and sustenance of art, science, philosophy, religion, the partial attainment of morality, of liberty, of democracy, the discovery of some truth, the creation of some goodness and some beauty, the founding of great cities, the experience of great loves. But one discovers as one reads Berdyaev that his criterion of success is anyhow false. He complains that in terrestrial history perfection is impossible. It has never been attained. And so history is a failure.

## *A Program*

### IS IT A QUESTION OF CHANGING HUMAN NATURE ?

No better index of the harm generated by the assumption of the psychological maturity of men and women is to be found than that furnished by the rejection of democracy and co-operation on the ground that they require the alteration of an unalterable human nature. Autocracy, exploitative-ness, competitiveness and war are supposed to be in some way intrinsic to human nature. This is to presuppose that human nature has in the past and present attained the fullest limits of growth, and that the autocrat, the warrior and the exploiter have been psychologically full-grown beings.

*It is against human nature*: this is the sophistic phrase which has been used as an "argument" against every proposal to lift the level of human life one notch higher. Now human nature is a vast and complex affair, a thing of many aspects, a "dome of many colors." Human nature has its constants and its variables, its permanent and its transient features, its alterable and unalterable parts. The sophistry in the phrase just quoted lies in its selection of the unalterable and constant aspects of human nature, and its neglect, pretended or ignorant, of the presence of plastic and

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

variable elements. But this is an aside. What it is wanted to stress here is this, that underneath the unchangeableness-of-human nature argument there lies the unwitting assumption that the nature of the human beings of the past and present is a full-blown, ripe, mature human nature. I see no evidence that it has been anything of the sort, at least as far as the greater majority of humans is concerned. This majority has been composed of men and women whose human nature wanted not so much to change as to grow, or, if you like, to change through growth.

Progress requires then, not the alteration of human nature, but its fuller growth, or, if you like, its transfiguration through growth. Progress, when it sets its face toward culture, as culture has been defined in this book, is indeed a growth and a transformation of the human spirit.

### SACRED INSTITUTIONS

Ways of life and social systems are valuable in so far as they enable human beings to grow into maturity, that is to say, to become human beings. Exploitative, competitive and autocratic institutions have possessed value, particularly for the ruling minority, but it has been a limited and



## *A Program*

dubious value, precisely because they have allowed very few, even among the members of the minority in question, to acquire a full human stature. This is something that modes of life and social systems, past and present, have rarely permitted to happen. Such being the case, extant ways of life and social institutions require alteration, even fundamental alteration, wherever necessary, and this no matter what their age, no matter who the great man or men who set them up, no matter how large the number of martyrs who died in their defense. Nor need any attention be paid to the plea of sacredness. An institution is sacred only if and when it facilitates human maturation. If it does not do that, if it functions in the opposite direction, it is speaking nonsense to apply to it the appellation *sacred*. But perhaps it would be better to drop the term *sacred*, with its suggestion of mysticism, and think of social machinery as just that — machinery, containing no intrinsic sacredness, and deriving its value from what it does.

For too long a time, for too many centuries, has human growth been sacrificed so that institutions allegedly sacred might continue to exist, but primarily so that those who in one way or another profit by their continued existence might continue to do so. Enough of this sacrifice.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### A GENERAL PROGRAM

No detailed program for the reconstruction of extant ways of life and social institutions, for the establishment of growth-facilitating behavior-patterns and social arrangements can or need be offered here. The problem is not a simple one, and no short and facile platform, containing a few easily understandable planks, will suffice. The problem is on the contrary a highly complex one, and it will require the utilization to the full of the resources of all the sciences that have any bearing on the subject, with religion, philosophy, statesmanship and the arts contributing all they can. But it will not be out of order to indicate the main lines along which the advance is to be made. This and subsequent chapters offer a few suggestions.

1. The democratization of human activity. Democracy has been defined as a way of life and a mode of social relationship such that the growth of one human being is facilitated by, and in its turn facilitates, the growth of other human beings. There is only one other way of life, one other kind of social relatedness, but it can only arrest, not facilitate, growth. The first proposal, vague though it be, must therefore be to democratize every department of human activity. This means

## *A Program*

the elimination, as far as it is possible, of every kind of exploitation and dictatorship. Social relations should be fashioned in such wise that the growth of no one shall be sacrificed to make possible the growth of another; and it is proposed that no one shall determine the destiny of another without that other's participation and consent, except where such participation is manifestly impossible. Exactly what form democracy is to take in any given place and time must be determined by the persons concerned and with due consideration for local exigencies and circumstances.

(The order in which the following items appear is of no significance.)

2. The transformation of government into a collaboration between trained statesmen and administrators on the one hand and scientists and technologists on the other, with special emphasis on the application to social problems of the findings of biology, endocrinology, psychology and the social sciences. By trained statesmen and administrators I mean men and women who have completed a required course in theoretical and practical studies, and whose education has fitted them for work with scientists and technologists. In short, it is proposed that intelligence, throughout almost all history barred from the halls of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

government, shall finally be admitted thereto. Political affairs shall, for the first time in history, be lifted from the level of psychological immaturity to that of psychological maturity.

3. The socialization of the instruments of production and distribution. This seems to be essential if economic affairs are to be lifted from a psychologically immature, exploitative, competitive and autocratic level to one psychologically more mature, co-operative and democratic. It seems to be essential if material wealth is to function as a condition of human growth, rather than a symbol of power. Under socialization wealth could be distributed and consumed, instead of being concentrated and flaunted.

For the growth of the human personality, the satisfaction of elementary biological wants and the enjoyment of economic security are absolutely essential. All this is out of the question under any system that tolerates economic exploitation, since the latter puts the exploited in a position where these essentials are either denied it or placed in jeopardy. A system of private ownership of the means of production and distribution is an exploitative system, for it is a profit-system, and a profit-system that does not involve the enrich-

## *A Program*

ment of the owner at the expense of others has not yet been devised.

4. The transfiguration of human activity so as to reduce economic and political activities to a secondary and ancillary status and lift cultural activities in the sense of the creation and appreciation of artistic, scientific, philosophical, religious and ethical values to a primary level. It is proposed that cultural affairs be placed first in importance and in time and energy expenditure. Economic and political activities, to the extent that they came to constitute a pursuit of ethical values, using ethical to mean the behavior that makes for the psychological maturation of one's self and others, would themselves be assimilated to cultural enterprise.

5. The establishment of freedom of thought. There can be no maturation of the personality where human beings cannot enter into free communication with each other. The human personality cannot grow in the dark. It requires light.

6. The abolition of war and all military institutions, except those that may be necessary for the constitution of an international police force. A world of mature human beings would probably organize an international society almost as a matter of course. The grouping of human beings into



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

militant crowds called nations, or into militant and power-seeking crowds of any kind, is, as has already been explained, a common phenomenon on the level of psychological immaturity.

7. The limitation of births to provide those that are born with opportunities for growth — and, it might be added, to provide parents, too, with opportunities for growth. Parenthood is, to be sure, a growth-fostering experience — provided a limit is placed on the number of children. An excess of children, when it is not fatal to the mother, converts parenthood from an educational experience to a debilitating drudgery. And when that happens, the children suffer as well as the parents. The growth of the child requires the continued and concentrated attention of the parents — and the teachers. Large families and large classes are among the greatest barriers to personality growth ever invented.

A eugenic program should also aim at the prevention of reproduction by those who cannot bring into the world children capable of both physical and psychological growth.

8. Compulsory education for all up to the termination of the college course. This means the abolition not only of child labor, but of the labor of adolescents as well. If education is in the in-

## *A Program*

terest of society, then educational resources ought to be placed at the disposal of all, and all ought to be compelled to make use of them. Or, to put the case differently, all children and adolescents should be provided with all the instrumentalities of growth and maturation, and they ought to be compelled to employ them. This may have a tyrannical sound, but no one now considers the compulsory education of children a manifestation of tyranny. Real tyranny is hostile to education. Tyrants want no mature personalities about. Such personalities are dangerous. But if the maturation of all is the condition of the completest maturation of one, then it is to the interest of society and every individual component thereof to compel the fullest use by every child and adolescent of the educational facilities society has to offer.

To the objection that not all youths are capable of college studies, the reply may be made that those who fail in them may be suffering from an intellectual or volitional arrest for which either the college or pre-college environment, or both, may be responsible. The solution of the problem of adolescent educability lies in an attack upon these environments, rather than in the closing of the college gates to anyone. Further, many a youth who fails in a given college course may be

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

capable of excelling in one better suited to his tastes and abilities. In addition, if the college of the future will equip itself with a staff of psychologists, neurologists and endocrinologists, it will find itself in a position to cure the backwardness of many a student.

### AN EXPERIMENT WITH DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

Other proposals suggest themselves — the application to educational practice of the resources of biology, psychology, sociology, endocrinology and physics; the democratization of the family with reference to the relation of every member of the family to every other member; the democratization of the school, with reference to the relation between pupil and pupil, pupil and teacher, teacher and teacher, and teacher and administrator. And it will not be amiss parenthetically to refer to a recent experiment designed to test the effect on the personality and on social relations of autocratic and democratic procedures. It is described by Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt in an article entitled *An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note*, in the January-April, 1938, issue of *Sociometry*.

## *A Program*

Two mask-making clubs of ten and eleven year old children were organized. Each club was composed of five members. In the autocratic club, the leader determined the policies, dictated the techniques and steps one at a time, assigned tasks, decided who was to work with whom, criticized and praised, but remained impersonal and aloof from group participation. In the democratic club the policies were determined by the group. The group selected technical procedures from among the alternatives proposed by the leader. It assigned tasks, but left each member free to choose his partner. The leader did not participate in the work of mask-making, but attempted to be a group member in spirit. He stayed on the level of the group; he made no attempt to behave like a god legislating from on high.

The results were most interesting. There was a higher state of tension in the autocratic club. There was thirty times as much hostility here as in the democratic group. The latter exhibited more co-operation. The democratic club saw many more constructive suggestions offered; there was more give and take of criticism. It turned out superior products. The autocratic group showed more careless and unfinished work. The democratic club tended to maintain a higher degree of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

unity. Two members quit the autocratic club, in protest against being made scapegoats. The democratic group exhibited a better developed feeling for group property and group goals.

This experiment is of course not decisive, but it is quite suggestive.



## CHAPTER XV

### SHALL INTELLIGENCE BE BROUGHT TO BEAR ON SOCIAL PROBLEMS?

ONE of the things that need to be done if we are to curb collective paranoia and liberate reason, is to devise agencies by which the reflective experience and the best intelligence of the human race, as expressed in science and philosophy, can be brought to bear on the solution of the problems of society.

No, I am not proposing that scientists and philosophers be placed in charge of the body politic. I do not advocate the placement of scientists and philosophers in executive or legislative posts. That is, I do not advocate this as a general policy, but it is well to bear in mind that there have been thinkers who possessed great executive capacity — men like Masaryk, Benes, Balfour, Haldane, Smuts, Mill — and who belong to a type that should certainly not be barred from office. What I do advocate is a collaboration of statesman and scientist, of legislative or judicial or executive

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

officer and scientific or philosophical counsellor. This means the election or selection of executives, legislators and judges intelligent enough to assimilate and apply scientific counsel. It means the provision of ways and means by which a government — local, national, or international — could readily avail itself of the resources of science. The best way of assuring this result is to admit scientists and philosophers into the councils of government in at least an advisory capacity.

### PRACTICE VERSUS THEORY NOT THE ISSUE

There is an issue involved here, and it is being misinterpreted by the politician as one between practice and theory. And this, it is needless to say, is the way the public sees it too. It suits the politician who envisages intelligence as a rival rather than an aid, to represent himself before the public —and before himself — as a practical statesman, and to depict the scientist as popular myth misrepresents him — a mere pedant, isolated in a university, out of touch with something called reality, his mind filled with pure fancies woven out of the tenuous substance of his consciousness. Opposed to this dangerous theorist, is the practical politician, his realistic mind full of sage wisdom, garnered

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

from his personal experience, his party's experience, his country's experience, the world's experience; his soul full of devotion to the public weal, his courage equal to any of the nation's gravest problems. The politicians of all nations are like this; how the world keeps getting into one mess after another is therefore one of the profound mysteries of life. The amount of trouble in the world seems to vary directly as the increase in the number and the practicality and the realism of its politicians. Never was the world so full of practical and realistic politicians. Yet everyone seems to sense an impending disaster, world-wide and terrible.

Truth to tell, the politician of this or any other age recalls Plato's jesting argument for the existence of God. When he observes what rulers the states and cities have, he feels certain there must be a God, else how could these states and cities survive? Thus spoke one who saw that there would be no salvation for mankind until philosophy and government learned to work together.

The issue is not one between practice and theory. To be sure, the issue is one between phantasy and a realistic attitude, but the true champion of phantasy is not the scientist nor the philosopher, but the crowd with its collective paranoia. As for

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

realism, a more effective approach to reality than that furnished by science has yet to be discovered. This indeed is the issue for us today: shall we choose to be governed by the delusions of the crowd, or by the counselling reason of science?

Of course I hold no brief against the practical man of affairs in government. I only plead that we may impair our civilization if we do not quickly learn to discriminate between the genuine practicality of the statesman intelligent enough to employ scientific counsel, and the counterfeit practicality of the party politician and the paranoid dictator. We must learn, and that with the utmost speed, to distinguish between the type of action exhibited by him who is willing to be guided by the realism and objectivity of science, and that exhibited by one who is guided either by a sordid motive or a paranoid syndrome.

It is not hard to make this distinction. An elementary knowledge of psychology and history is a useful aid. An almost infallible touchstone, however, is this: any aspirant to leadership who denounces logic, intellect, thought, and scientific method, who sings paeans to action, and who joins all this to the preachment of hatred, can be set down as a public and paranoid enemy. These are among the obvious symptoms. The others are

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

familiar — the oracular, infallible attitude, the messianic delusion, the demand for absolute power.

One of the things to be borne in mind is this: as a rule, the self-reliant, mature practical man, the man of action who is confident of the strength of his will and his capacity for achievement, does not spill any individious rhodomontade about the superiority of action to thought, of the doer to the thinker, of the practical man to the theorist. One who indulges in this sort of comparison may be suspected of being interested not so much in deeds, as in ridding himself of a strong and annoying sense of his own inferiority.

### A COMMENT ON LASKI

As I have just said, I do not propose the substitution of the social scientist for the statesman. I would as soon suggest replacing the engineer by the physicist. It is, however, pertinent to criticize Laski's remarks in his book, *Democracy in Crisis*, in which he expresses great concern over what might be the consequences of replacing the statesman by the scientific expert. The latter, Laski says, is a specialist; but, alas, the fundamental issues of society require, not specialization, but the power to coordinate, the power to make value judgments, a power that is rooted in a divine com-



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

mon sense, to use his own expression. The expert is rather poor at evaluation and coordination, being given to the over-emphasis of his own specialty.

The statesman's problem is not a narrow one, but a problem of general direction and of the relative importance of his various objectives. The expert's problems are narrow, technical ones, resulting in a constriction of experience that limits his power to offer those broad judgments that statesmanship is called upon to make. Nor are the expert's conclusions necessarily objective in character; that depends on the material he works with. An engineer can objectively calculate the load a bridge can bear; but no objectivity attaches to the conclusion of an Indian civil servant of long experience concerning India's capacity for self-government. The engineer's calculation is an impersonal business; into the formulation of the Indian civil servant's conclusions too many personal elements enter. The material that social experts deal with does not lend itself to such objective methods as those employed by engineer and physicist.

In short, it is unwise to place in the hands of the expert in sociological matters the determination of the ends of society. This is to be left to the man with the statesman's sense of proportion,

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

talent for the co-ordination of various objectives, and ability to obtain from everyone the maximum degree of co-operation. Thus speaks Laski.

With Laski's plea that the sociological expert is no proper substitute for the statesman, it is easy to agree. One wishes, however, that he had laid some stress on the complementary relation between statesmanship and scientific intelligence; though he probably never intended it, he talks of the two as if they were at bottom antithetical. Those who oppose the application of intelligence to the problems of life in society will be tempted to read that meaning into Laski's words.

One of the proper roles of the expert in social matters, in his relation to the statesman, might be that of adviser. Except in those cases where he is fitted for it, the expert should not be given an executive, but an advisory post. He need be neither secretary, under-secretary, or minister, but just plain adviser.

I express fundamental agreement with Laski, but beg the privilege of dissenting at one or two points. Not all specialties are narrow. So broad a problem as the evaluation and co-ordination of ends is itself a specialty, and as such it falls within the province of the philosopher. The statesman may therefore call upon the philosopher for ad-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

vice, as Pericles called for that of Anaxagoras. There have, moreover, been philosophers and sociologists who combined theoretical talent with great practical ability. Let one bear in mind such instances as Confucius, Marcus Aurelius, John Stuart Mill, Lord Haldane, Balfour, Masaryk, Benes, Smuts, and others.

It is a question whether the objectivity of an expert's conclusions depends as much upon the material studied as upon the method employed. That human material is much less tractable to scientific analysis is undeniable; but neither can it be denied that the biological, psychological and social sciences are undergoing improvement in method, and that their methods are becoming more objective. Laski's comparison of the engineer and the Indian civil servant is illogical; the comparison should be between the engineer and a sociologist or political scientist highly conversant with Indian political affairs.

Finally, may not a specialist possess ample equipment for aiding in the determination of ends? The biologist is in a position to advise, not only on the administration, but also on the desirability of a eugenic program. The biologist, the sociologist, and the economist may be able to offer some sound advice concerning the relative merits

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

of a policy of peace and a policy of war. The psychologist can give a few pointers on the futility of censorship. The economist can be called in before social ownership is determined upon, as well as after.

### THE SUPERIORITY OF SCIENTIFIC METHOD

All the talk that is going on, even in scientific circles, concerning the inadequacy of the psychological and social sciences, about the great lacunae in their knowledge, and all the to-do about the fact that these sciences are the work of "theorists" rather than "practical" men, serves only to draw attention away from the one feature that makes the scientist immeasurably superior to the average politician as a controller of social destiny. And that feature is the *self-critical*, *self-corrective* character of science.

The case can be put this way. Whether or not the scientist knows more or less than the politician is not the important thing. The thing that counts is the fact that the scientist's *method* is superior to that of the politician. And the method happens to be the best one yet devised in all the history of mankind for the acquisition and augmentation of knowledge and for the filling of gaps and inadequacies therein.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

This method, known as the rational method, is the one most suitable for the cure and prevention of such states as delusion, deception, propaganda, prejudice, party partiality, rabid radicalism, stolid and stupid standpattism, fanaticism, demagoguery, and allied illnesses. It is neither a perfect preventive nor a completely curative agent. But it is the best medicine yet devised, and any political pharmacopeia that does not indicate reason as a more or less effective medicine for social ills is a quack pharmacopeia.

Yes, science and philosophy are, and in all probability always will be inadequate guides to the solution of our social problems, but their method is the one by which learning is effected, by which knowledge is augmented, by which gaps in knowledge are filled: the method of rational reflection upon experience. Science and philosophy make errors, but, being in their essence self-critical and self-corrective, they are engaged in a never-ceasing quest for these errors and in a never-ending effort to uproot them. The diametrical opposite of the political and the ecclesiastical spirit, with its rigidity, its dogmatism, its absoluteness, its intolerance, its suppression of criticism and correction, its delusion of infallibility.

Here then is at least one respect in which the



## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

scientist exhibits a greater degree of realism and of practicality than the politician, the bureaucrat and the dictator. Here it is the so-called practical man who is the bearer of dangerous phantasms and delusions. He is a dreamer and out of touch with reality who imagines that the good life for the individual and for society is best mediated through partisanship, propaganda, unalterable dogma, infallible creed, suppression of all ideas that sin in being other than one's own, and a party system, by means of which the party that is out does its utmost to hamper and block everything the party that is in seeks to accomplish!

The actual fact of the matter is that today it is the scientist and the philosopher — and the kind of practical man and woman who stand close to science — the engineer and the physician, for instance — who are realist enough and practical enough to know, first, that a fluid, evolving life calls for an evolving thought, and second, that the distinction between phantasm and realism is itself impossible except on a basis of reason and science. And if the politician employs neither science nor reason, his claim to realism and practicality is itself a phantasm.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### THE AVERAGE MAN'S OPPOSITION TO SOCIAL SCIENCE

The explanations that are usually given for the failure of philosophy and the social, psychological and biological sciences to find wide application are absurdly fantastic. And they are fantastic because they presuppose a very wide distribution of an extraordinary mental capacity among the mass of men and women. These are held to be competent to pass judgment on philosophy and the sciences; they are supposed to reject these disciplines on account of their "theoretical" nature, their "inadequacies," their "isolation from reality," their "impracticality." These are indeed the reasons given by the average person when asked to explain the contemptuous gesture with which he dismisses the claims of philosophy and the sciences for a voice in the determination of social events. In truth, the average citizen deceives himself.

What, after all, is and for a long time will continue to be the greatest obstacle to the application of science and philosophy to the disposal of social problems? For an answer to this question, it is necessary to take note of a curious contradiction in the attitude of the ordinary man and woman toward the philosopher and the scientist. The or-

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

dinary person regards these as his intellectual superiors. He of course feels himself intellectually inferior to men like Freud, Dewey, Russell, Keynes, Laski, and other leaders of thought. He admits himself intellectually inferior to the workers in the biological, psychological and social sciences. Why then does he not call on them for advice on social problems? For an answer, it is but necessary to ask any average man or woman. And the answer is startling.

For the fact of the matter is that, incredible as it may seem, the ordinary person considers himself in a certain respect *superior* to any biologist, any psychologist, any sociologist, any economist, any political scientist, any philosopher — superior even to the geniuses of science and philosophy, even to men like Freud and Dewey and Russell. For the ordinary person compensates for his feeling of inferiority with reference to the thinker by a claim to the possession of organs of knowledge which enable him to acquire a complete stock of accurate and adequate truths on all subjects, and this without resort to such laborious methods as scientifically controlled observation, experiment, logical analysis, and self-criticism. These powerful organs of knowledge he calls common sense, in-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

tuition, practical sense, instinct, revelation, and the higher logic. They are conceived as beyond logic, a supralogic, as it were, and immeasurably superior thereto. They supply him with all he needs to know concerning the problems of society. There is therefore no need for calling in the scientists when society, the nation, the state, the city, or the family come face to face with a problem. Indeed, such a course would be dangerous, for the scientist's knowledge, being mediated by mere intellect, is mere theory, where the ordinary man's knowledge, mediated as it is by intuition, instinct or practical good sense, is absolute truth.

Now, as long as this situation obtains, there is no possibility of bringing scientific intelligence to bear on social problems, except where a statesman of unusual intelligence intervenes to bring this about.

### KNOWLEDGE BY INSTINCT ?

There is no such thing, among humans at any rate, as knowledge by instinct. The very phrase, *knowledge by instinct*, is misleading. Instinct is not a cognitive process. It is not a way of knowing at all. Instinct seems to be an inherited mode of response that links muscles, nerves and glands in

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

a united pattern of action. One may speak of the reacting organism as possessed of an instinctive knowledge of how to act in a given type of situation, but only elliptically. It is not knowledge in the sense in which that term is generally used — the conscious apprehension of the qualities and the pattern exhibited by a thing, process or situation. An instinctive response may indeed involve such knowledge, but the latter is itself mediated by processes other than instinct. And if one insist that the instinctive response-pattern of an organism is real knowledge — the knowledge of what to do in a given type of situation — the obvious answer is, that such knowledge is restricted to responses to simple situations. It is a knowledge unfitted for coping with the complex problems that face modern society. What aid can instinctive knowledge, if there be such a thing, furnish us in such matters as the reform of the law, the abolition of racketeering, the admission of women to juries, the elimination of waste in county government, the lifting of tariff barriers, the strengthening of the League of Nations, the encouragement of experiments in education, the collectivization of industry, and so on? These are all complex and technical problems, before which instinct can only stand blind and baffled. They are problems for the mind, not for



the spinal nerves, or the striped muscles, or the endocrine glands.

And if there be such a thing as knowledge by instinct? Well, just suppose there is. Is instinct infallible? Is it something that supersedes the deliverances of reason, something that does not have to stand before the bar of reason and justify itself and compel its revelations to square with those of reason? What is instinct that it should possess any priority? And if it is not infallible, why should not its deliverances be required to undergo analysis and criticism and the test of experiment (which is what is meant by standing before the bar of reason)? But instinct, you say, offers us certain knowledge. Does it? Then why do people who rely on "instinct" contradict each other? And why does the person who relies on "instinct" contradict himself ten times in the course of the same argument? And how do we know but that the certainty of instinct is not a delusion? A rational man may delude himself, but then it is the part of rationality to be self-critical and to discover its own delusions. But instinct is not self-critical. How therefore does it guard against self-delusion?

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

### KNOWLEDGE BY INTUITION ?

And is there such a thing as intuition — poetic intuition, philosophical intuition, religious intuition, woman's intuition, or just plain, ordinary intuition? And if there is such a thing, what is it? Has any one taken note of the circumstances in which use of the term is resorted to? When someone finds an idea in his or her head, and does not have the faintest notion of how it ever got there, he credits what he terms his intuition. Or when a novel idea makes a sudden appearance in consciousness, intuition is again invoked. Intuition seems, indeed, to be the name given to an instantaneous process, in which perception and rational inference exist in a highly compressed form. This is probably what intuition really is — a combination of perception and judgment, in which the logical process exists in foreshortened form, or perhaps takes place below the threshold of consciousness.

Now a procedure of this kind cannot be relied upon to solve complex problems, let alone problems of the complexity of those which confront society. True enough, the student of problems of any complexity often has flashes of insight that light them up and lead to a solution, but these

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

flashes come only after *prolonged and intense ratiocination* and, further, that which these insights reveal require to be worked up by the *reason*, they require subjection to *criticism, analysis, and the test of experiment* — there is nothing infallible about them.

Certain it is, however, that in dealing with a problem, it is not sufficient to rely on an occasional flash of insight. We are simply forced, if we really desire a solution, to rely on the exercise of reason.

Further, concerning intuition, the same thing must be said which was said of instinct. If there be any such thing as intuitional knowledge, no infallibility attaches to it. The revelations, if any, of intuition, may be mistaken and they must therefore undergo the tests of criticism, analysis and experiment. To assert, as so many do, that intuition is self-validating is but to beg the question. Self-validation is self-delusion. "Intuitive" persons contradict themselves and each other.

(Yes, I know that reason too errs, and that rational folk contradict each other and themselves. But reason is consciously and deliberately *self-critical*. It analyzes its own deliverances, criticizes them, subjects them to experimental tests. Reason errs, but it honestly strives to discover and uproot its errors. It is not infallible, and it can-

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

didly admits that fact, and having done so, proceeds to act upon it.)

When a person attributes an idea to his or her intuition, there are four questions to be asked of him. Is there such a thing as intuition? If there is, how does he know that he possesses that organ of knowledge? If he does possess it, how does he know that the idea he terms intuitive actually had its source in his intuition, and not in something else? And if originate in his intuition it did, does that render the idea infallibly true?

As for common sense, we need not bother asking whether there is any such thing, for even if the average citizen does possess it, it is woefully inadequate in the face of our frightfully complex social problems. These problems require something more than just common sense, if there be any such thing. They require a more than ordinary knowledge, a more than ordinary exercise of the intellect, and an extraordinary degree of objectivity. It is well to bear in mind the words of Lord Thomson, that common sense tells one that the earth is flat and that the sun goes round the earth.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

### THE REAL AVERAGE MAN

The point should also be borne in mind that this individual citizen whose "instinct," "intuition" and "common sense" suffice to render him competent to solve all social problems is after all an unreal abstraction. He is pictured as if he were an isolated fact, when as a matter of fact this is precisely what he is not. Being a member of society, he is always a member of two, three or more crowds: a political crowd, a professional crowd, a religious crowd, a race, a nation, a sex, and so on. This means he is always subject to crowd influences. And this means he is a victim of several collective paranoias simultaneously.

What does this signify? Simply this: that when "instinct," "intuition" and "common sense" speak on social problems, their "voices" are not their own. Their voices are too often the collective voice of the crowd. It is not from some inner oracle, and it is not from observation or experience, but from external sources — the social environment and the crowd — that the average man and woman derive many of their ideas. Their minds are focal points on which there converge a thousand external influences, suggestions, preachments,



propagandas, exhortations, intimidations, and coercions.

The alert, bright-eyed, clear-minded, practical, realistic average citizen, full of instinctive, intuitive and common-sense knowledge, is a figment of the imagination. No such creature exists, neither male nor female (feminists, in their delusion of sex superiority, maintain that the species does exist, and that it is entirely female). If anyone wishes to verify my thesis, let him hold discourse on social problems with as many ordinary persons as possible.

I have held such discourse — with average men, with average women. The results are uniformly depressing, intolerably bad, in fact. Such mental confusion, such ignorance of elementary facts, such patent disregard of facts that do not fit one's credo, such illogical prattle, such failure to think things through, such incoherence, every proposition contradicting the one before and the one after, such intellectual impoverishment, such a defective sense of reality, such intolerance of dissent, such bigotry as there reveal themselves to the sight!

Yes, of course, there are exceptions, perhaps many exceptions. But they are still — exceptions.

One man to me is as ten thousand, if he be the

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

best, said Heraclitus. Paraphrasing him, I say one rational and intelligent social scientist or philosopher is as ten thousand intuitive, instinctive, common-sensed laymen.

And as for the leaders — our political, industrial, ecclesiastical, military leaders — they are as a rule the victims and the voices of the collective paranoias of their respective crowds — the paranoias they help to generate. And they exhibit each and every one of the vices I have just now enumerated. In the colleges, classes in logic are taught to study the speeches of these leaders as models of fallacious thought.

The question to be asked is not, as some would have it, whether scientists and philosophers are competent to advise our public men. The real question is the reverse of that. Are the latter competent to work with the makers of philosophy and science, to take counsel with them and to utilize their advice?

What is after all the real and hidden reason for the average person's and his average leader's refusal to work with philosopher and scientist in the field of social problems? Is it not fear — fear lest the intellectual superiority of the thinker become too manifest — fear lest his pronouncements prove true, and the politician's and ordinary citizen's

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

false — fear lest the philosopher's and scientist's advice compel arduous, albeit necessary, efforts to change our way of life and our social institutions?

### NO DICTATORSHIP OF THE INTELLECTUAL

Of course I am not proposing to substitute science for universal suffrage. I am an advocate of democracy, not an opponent. But I oppose an uninformed, unintelligent democracy, a democracy that never learns, or learns with difficulty, because handicapped by its delusion of the infallibility of instinct, intuition, and common sense, whatever these may be — if they be. I believe, however, that a democratic society can learn — and it can learn to take counsel of those who are best able to advise it.

I am not even thinking of proposing such a thing as a dictatorship of the scientist or philosopher. Such a dictatorship is impracticable and unnecessary, and it would generate essentially the same evils as does dictatorship of any other kind. A democracy, if it would learn the art of self-government, must practice self-government, be the cost what it may. And for the scientist and the philosopher to become dictators, it would first be necessary for them to turn into megalomaniacs.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

And if they did not start out as such, they would acquire the appropriate syndrome a little while after assuming power. Dictatorship corrupts dictator as well as dictated.

Anyhow, a dictatorship of scientist and philosopher would stultify science and philosophy. It would impel the scientist and the philosopher to convert their disciplines into a mass of rationalizations designed to justify their rule. It would effectively close their minds to all facts and considerations hostile to these rationalizations. But enough of this — no one seriously suggests this most absurd form of dictatorship — although one is sometimes tempted to believe that certain nations might profitably come under the dictatorship of psychiatrist and psychoanalyst.

The philosopher and the scientist should stand to the electorate in a purely advisory relation — except in that minority of cases in which theoretical and practical talents are combined. Their function should be to study, advise, criticize, and enlighten. They should speak freely, and allow everyone the right to speak as freely in criticism of their, the scientists' and philosophers', ideas. They should teach — and learn.

## *Intelligence and Social Problems*

### INTELLIGENT COUNSELLORS IN THE PAST

Those people who do not believe in a first time, the believers in precedent, will be gratified to learn that intelligence in the shape of scientific expertness or philosophical counsel has on several occasions in history been invited to aid in the disposal of social problems. One of the first philosophers, perhaps, indeed, the first, to hold the reins of government, Confucius, was successful enough to arouse a degree of jealousy sufficient to unseat him. Parmenides, in the sixth century B. C., was said to have been a legislator at Elea, a Greek colony in Italy. Pericles employed Anaxagoras as his adviser. Seneca held office in Rome. Marcus Aurelius was emperor. Boethius, who lived in the fifth and sixth centuries A. D., was a Roman consul. Avicenna, who lived in the tenth and eleventh centuries, was adviser to several Persian potentates. Averroes was a judge at Seville and Cordova. John Locke was a commissioner on the governmental Board of Trade in Britain. Leibnitz was councillor to the courts of Brunswick and Hanover. John Stuart Mill was for thirty years an officer of the East India Company, which was in his time the government of India. Balfour was prime minister, and much more besides. R. B. Haldane was in the



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

cabinet and a good many other posts. Jan Christiaan Smuts has been South African prime minister, and a good deal else besides. Masaryk was president of Czechoslovakia, and Benes is a sociologist. When Robert M. La Follette was governor of Wisconsin, he and his legislative leaders regularly consulted the members of the sociology and economics departments of Wisconsin University. Governor Alfred E. Smith drew up his recommendation for prison reform with the aid of the late Dr. Max Schlapp, penologist. President Franklin D. Roosevelt has made use of economists as advisers, which has caused a great outcry among "practical" men who did not deem it impractical for America to send economists to foreign governments to advise them in the disposal of their economic problems.

Yes, intelligence has on occasion and in a small way wormed its way into the halls of government. And there is no telling what will happen if it should enter those halls as a great and permanent ally of statesmanship. If it should get very far, it might effect the greatest social revolution in history. Try to imagine the consequences of a displacement, in public affairs, of stupidity by intelligence, an infallible by a critical attitude, institutional rigidity by institutional flexibility, hit and miss methods by scientific experiment — yes,

yes it is dangerous to experiment with human beings, but we are always doing that, even when we are doing nothing. And imagine, if you can, the consequences of displacing collective paranoia by the processes of reason!

I do not dream of a complete displacement; but if the process should go on at least a part of the way, the results might be sufficient to stagger the imagination.

A world that took counsel of science would of course not be a perfect world. It would have its faults. But some of these faults, at least, would be those incidental to progress. And that is a different thing from a world with faults due to a failure to make progress. It would be a world with the faults incidental to sociological achievement, rather than one marked by the defects resulting from the stunting and paralysis of such achievement.

## CHAPTER XVI

### POLITICAL INSTRUMENTS FOR THE MEDIATION OF INTELLIGENCE

BY what means shall it be provided that scientific intelligence be brought to bear on the problems of society?

When an individual wants scientific advice, he calls on one who is in possession of scientific knowledge and scientific habits of mind. The latter then stands in consultative relation to his client.

Society can also call on those who possess scientific knowledge and the ability to employ scientific methods, to stand in a consultative relation to it in its endeavor to solve its problems. How may such a consultative relation be most conveniently established?

Since society, when operating to solve a problem, functions mainly through its governmental institutions — international, national, and local — it is with these specifically that the consultative relation will have to be established. How may this best be accomplished?

## *Political Instruments and Intelligence*

### SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARDS FOR GOVERNMENTS

The correlation of government and science might be made to follow some such lines as these. Every one of the executive departments of a government — local, national or international — would be provided with a small board of permanent scientific consultants. The executive head of the government — president, premier, governor, mayor, or whatever else he might be called — would have his own small board of permanent scientific — and philosophical — consultants. The department boards would aid in the formulation of the policies of their respective departments. The general board — that is, the board attached to the executive head of the government — would advise concerning the most general matters of policy. It would assist in the formulation of long-range policies affecting the entire body politic.

The members of the general and the department boards would be consulted in the preparation of legislation. In this task they would collaborate with the law-drafting committees of the legislature. There would therefore be no need for separate permanent consultants for the legislative side of the government.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

To the judicial department — the courts — would be attached permanent advisory boards composed of criminologists and medical experts, including psychiatrists. Courts dealing with juvenile delinquents would require the services of child psychologists; courts handling domestic cases, sociologists and consulting psychologists. The psychiatrists attached to the criminal courts would be employed in the determination of the sanity or insanity of the defendants — a procedure that would eliminate the scientific scandals growing out of the current practice of hiring psychiatrists to find what they are paid to find.

When executive departments already have scientists in their employ, as in the case of a department of agriculture with its botanists or a ministry of health hiring bacteriologists and physicians, then the scientific heads of the department's several bureaus and divisions would enter into the composition of its permanent board, other scientific experts being added if advisable or necessary.

There would arise occasions when the head of a government, or a government department, or a legislative committee, or a judicial body would find it necessary or advisable to call in a scientist not a member of any of the permanent boards. In addition to the permanent consulting scientists



## *Political Instruments and Intelligence*

and technicians, there would, then, be the temporary consultants. And every scientist, theoretical or practical, not a member of any of the permanent boards, would be a potential temporary consultant.

### IN CASE THE SCIENTISTS DISAGREE

This is as good a place as any in which to deal with the objection that is often raised against the proposal to admit scientists into the halls of government. The objection is this, that scientists disagree among themselves. They fall out among themselves; they split into so many schools of thought. Physicists, chemists, biologists, psychologists, economists, physicians, engineers; all disagree among themselves.

It is indeed true that scientists are not in unanimous agreement upon most things; it is not entirely a misfortune that this should be so. The existence of divergent schools of thought with reference to a given problem betokens not only independence of spirit and originality of mind, but also the pursuit of research in many different directions. Only they who hold to a simple notion of reality believe that the attainment of truth requires merely that search be directed along one line

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

and in one direction only. Such a course would mean the impoverishment of science. Every problem that science deals with is a thing with many facets, and fruitfulness in hypotheses is essential for fruitfulness of results. Within limits, disagreement is good.

The fact of disagreement need not, however, constitute a barrier to the admission of scientists into the councils of government. For one thing, it has not prevented scientists from doing useful and important work in those government departments to which they have already been admitted. Physicians disagree, but the United States Public Health Service and the health departments of states and cities are not therefore failures. Psychiatrists disagree, but federal and state hospitals find it useful to employ them, nevertheless. Biologists conflict, but a state that writes a sterilization law upon its statute books has to consult them in its enforcement. Educators fall out among themselves, but who is better fitted to take charge of a public school system?

However, it is not in the fact of disagreement itself that danger ever lies. Dangerous only is the inability or the unwillingness rationally to resolve disagreements. Most people, politicians included, are more or less helpless in the face of a conflict

## *Political Instruments and Intelligence*

of opinions. No nation has so much as thought of teaching its children how to go about resolving such conflicts. Scientists themselves often fail, but they at least are acutely aware of two things: first, that schisms are to be faced with reason, not with the emotions; second, that the determination of the truth or falsity of an idea often requires the experimental application thereof.

### SOCIAL EXPERIMENTATION

The very word experiment, when used in connection with social problems, makes many people shudder. Human beings and human communities cannot, they protest, be made the subjects of experiment. Human beings are not guinea pigs. To be sure, they are not. And it is not being suggested that the scientific counsellor to the government be permitted experimentally to test any theory that may enter his head. The reader must bear in mind throughout this discussion that it is being proposed that government shall be a collaboration between practical statesmen and their scientific advisers, with neither the one nor the other acting alone, but both in concert.

At the same time, it must be said of those who oppose scientific experimentation on human beings

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

and communities that they are being most unrealistic. For experiment one must, and experiment one does. All governments, no matter what sort of people they are composed of, experiment, always have experimented, and always will experiment. Even a do-nothing government experiments, doing nothing being itself an experiment, and often the most dangerous one of all. The issue is not one between experiment and no experiment, but between experiment that is blind and groping, and experiment that is scientifically enlightened.

I cannot find it easy to sympathize with people like Sir John Marriott, the English political scientist, who shudder more at the thought of the damage that theorists might cause than they do at the sight of the fearful destruction that dictators and politicians have actually wrought.

Under the scheme proposed here, no experiment would be embarked upon except with the approval of those to whom the scientists stood in a consultative relation. Further, it could be provided that no experiment involving very important matters of policy could be undertaken without the consent of the electorate, expressed through a referendum.

## *Political Instruments and Intelligence*

### A NEW TYPE OF POLITICIAN AND POLITICAL MACHINERY

It goes without saying that the scheme proposed here requires politicians of a type vastly superior to that which has been the rule in the past and present. Indeed, it requires nothing less than that the politician shall himself be scientifically minded. He must be intelligent enough and democratic enough to comprehend and critically to evaluate and accept scientific advice. He must know what science is all about. The politician of the stupid type, who identifies his own incoherent set of ideas with truth and who, in his delusion of infallibility, contemptuously sweeps all science aside as just so much theory, will simply have to go. And nobody will miss him, except those who use government for certain purposes of their own.

The introduction of scientific intelligence into governmental operations may eventually involve a reform, not only of the politician, but of the machinery of government itself. When and if government becomes an affair of rational beings, when and if the latter replace the immature and power-intoxicated fools who constitute the class of politicians in all countries, the cumbersome machinery of modern government will probably be scrapped.



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

Kings, presidents, governors, mayors, vice-presidents, lieutenant-governors, and unwieldy legislative bodies will, let us hope, be cast into the discard. If scientific counsel is to be employed in the treatment of social problems, what need is there for all these things? A small, compact body of intelligent men and women, with a chairman at its head, all working in collaboration with expert scientific advisers, should be able to perform the duties now performed by a legislature and the executive head of the government. There are cities that have discarded their mayors and their aldermanic boards and that get along quite well with a small board of commissioners, headed by a chairman.

## CHAPTER XVII

### THE IMPRACTICALITY OF PARTY GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT by science may mean an end to government by party.

Sooner or later, the party system may have to be given up. Sooner or later, it may become necessary to take the government out of politics.

The party system is supposed to be a practical system — the most practical system of government known. People are actually unrealistic enough to believe such a thing. The party method involves an absurdly impractical procedure. Under this system one set of men and women, whenever it endeavors to accomplish something, finds itself blocked by another set, the chief objective of which is to hinder the first set from achieving anything but failure. The party that is in finds itself opposed by the party that is out. The latter makes it its especial business to encompass the failure of the administrative party. There are, of course, exceptions to the rule, but it is the rule that is being discussed now. And the rule, the rule of govern-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

ment by party is this, that the administration shall make an effort, and the opposition shall block that effort; that whenever the party that is in makes a move, the party that is out shall hold it back; that the ins shall endeavor to make a success of their government, and the outs shall practice sabotage and cause the ins to fail. Is this a practical procedure?

Merely to describe the operation of such a system is to exhibit it in all its absurdity. A society entrusts its problems and its fate to a set of politicians, who, with their followers, are divided into two or more groups, each group taking on itself the function of obstructing the others! A comic procedure, with tragic results. What else could the results be? And the results are sometimes inconceivably tragic, as was the case after the war, when the Republican Party, for reasons that were primarily partisan, defeated President Wilson's proposal to make the United States a member of the League of Nations. Undoubtedly, both the Republican and Democratic parties were moved by considerations that had to do with party prestige, rather than with world peace. How else explain the fact that most Democrats sided with Wilson, and most Republicans opposed him? The Republicans placed party interests before world peace —

## *Impracticality of Party Government*

and it may yet become possible to say that this act was one of the factors in the destruction of modern civilization.

Given the party system, it becomes difficult for a government to address itself directly to any problem — administrative or social — that it may conceive it its function to solve. For under this system, every attempt to deal with a problem becomes instantly converted into a struggle for mastery waged between the administrative party and all other parties. The effect of this is to obscure the issue and to distract public attention from the real matter at hand. A needless complication is introduced, the will to power takes precedence over the will to achieve the solution of a problem, and, what is equally bad, partisan emotions are engendered and rationality is driven into the background.

Who can now wonder at the ineffectualness of modern governments? Is it any wonder that they are, as a rule, failing to cope with the problems that beset modern society?

The fiction must be disposed of once and for all that the party is an effectual social problem-solving instrument. Social problem-solving is a task for rational folk. But a party, like every other kind of militant crowd, is an *irrational* crea-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

ture. That is to say, the individuals who compose the party, however reasonable they may be in other respects, find it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, rationally to deal with those issues to which the party addresses itself. And the reason for it is this, that a party wants power above and before anything else. Power, might, conquest, triumph, rule — these words express the ideals and comprise the vocabulary of a party. On the subject of power, the party — that is, its component individuals — becomes hyper-sensitive. That collective paranoia that we have already made the acquaintance of constantly manifests itself. And of collective paranoia every party has at least a trace — usually it is more than a trace. The parties that aim at dictatorship are not the only sufferers from this malady; but in them the illness attains its apogee.

### MELODRAMA AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR REASON

One of the most wholesome effects of the substitution of scientific for party government, of rational procedure for collective paranoia, would be the partial elimination of the theatricalism that constitutes a necessary concomitant of controversy conducted on a plane other than the rational.



## *Impracticality of Party Government*

Childish have been the methods that have been employed in settling controversies in the past — childish and irrelevant. The organization of militant parties or associations; the melodramatic vows of eternal fealty to this ideology or that creed; the demonstrations, parades, uniforms, colored shirts, salutes, banners, brass bands; the persecutions, inquisitions, barricades, wars, martyrs: these have entered into the constitution of the method by which this world of children has sought to “solve” its problems.

I am not decrying loyalties and enthusiasms; I deplore the fact that they so often operate on a childish level. After all, it is not necessary to be immature in order to be enthusiastic and loyal. And one owes it oneself to practice those loyalties and enjoy those enthusiasms that make for his maturity and growth. For an adult to practice loyalties on a juvenile level is to be disloyal to himself.

The opinions of people who know little or nothing of either reality or reason to the contrary notwithstanding, a rational politics may be confidently expected to be more realistic than the irrational kind. After all, it may be confidently asserted that science and philosophy, reason and tolerance, test-tubes and statistics, experiment and

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

meditation, are more likely to bring men and women closer to the real world than the delusions of the crowd, the miasma of party strife, hate and fear, censorship and intolerance, demonstrations and parades, brass bands and banners, uniforms and colored shirts.

One of the gravest faults of party government is this, that it renders difficult, when it does not make impossible, the concentration of a nation's best intelligence upon any social problem that a government may address itself to. Every party, as a rule, numbers at least a few highly intelligent persons among its members — persons who can speak with authority on current social problems. The defeat of a party at the polls may involve the exclusion of a portion of a nation's best intelligence from direct participation in the treatment of that nation's problems. For this excluded intelligence there may be left no other role than that of critic — a valuable enough role, to be sure, but a role of limited effectiveness.

### FACTIONS

It is no argument in favor of the party system that people will always split into factions and that they will always hold divergent views. This is, on

## *Impracticality of Party Government*

the contrary, an argument *against* the party system ! There is only one known method for resolving ideological differences, and that is the rational method. The latter requires an ability to take an objective attitude: an ability to transcend factional lines, so as to permit the operation of a rational critique of one's own as well as other standpoints. This the party method does not allow. The party, as has been seen, is a human association afflicted with collective paranoia. That is to say, it is composed of individuals who cannot, without difficulty, engage in rational discourse upon those issues to which the party addresses itself.

*Factions* there will always be, but it does not follow that there must *parties*. The very presence of factions renders requisite the absence of rigid party organizations, and this in order that reason be to that extent freed from the bondage of party feeling.

### DICTATORSHIP NOT THE SOLUTION

No, dictatorship is *not* the answer to the question posed by the party system. Dictatorship, as has been seen, is not a solution, but a problem, a problem in psychopathology. At any rate, all the

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

talk about dictatorship as a cure for party strife is both premature and misleading. Totalitarianism does not eliminate party conflict. It merely transfers it to another theater. It converts *inter-party* strife into *intra-party* conflict. Note the Stalin-Trotsky feud, and the struggle between the Roehm and Hitler factions. And the talk about the elimination of national disunity is quite premature. For, given the morbid character of dictatorship, given its mind- and will-stunting function, and one may confidently look forward to anarchy sweeping the dictatorial nations — except where a resurgent democracy functions to bring the pathogenic process to an end.

Dictatorship cannot be considered a solution, for it is a manifestation of that very absolutism out of which grew the very problem that dictatorship pretends to be able to solve. For what is after all the ultimate ground and origin of our political confusions and disorders, if not this, that centuries of absolutism have kept human beings from that growth and maturation without which there cannot be any genuine order? Aeons of absolutism have bequeathed to this generation a world of stunted souls, human beings only partly grown. What can dictatorship do but keep men and women on the low level on which it finds them?

## *Impracticality of Party Government*

In Germany and Italy it even pushes them back to a level still lower. For dictatorship is itself the expression of that same dwarfed humanity that is responsible for the social disorder that dictatorship pretends to be able to cure.



## CHAPTER XVIII

### ONE THING THE INDIVIDUAL MIGHT DO

THERE are certain things individuals cannot do acting alone. There are other things, however, which the individual can do, things which he can proceed to do without waiting for a group, organized or otherwise, to start something. He can, for instance, on many an occasion do that which he knows or believes to be ethically right. And he can, on most occasions, be just as rational as his capacity and his education permit. He can endeavor with all his might to be as rational, as thoughtful, as self-critical as it is possible for him to be. And in the attempt to be rational, he can call to his aid all the resources of science and philosophy, all their resources barring none.

No one can think of a social program, a constructive social program, that does not require the individual to lift himself a notch or two in the scale of rationality. In the last analysis, every constructive social enterprise depends upon such individual action. It is not to be denied that social

## *One Thing the Individual Might Do*

suggestion, crowd emotion, and group sentiment will go a long way. But no matter how far they take one, a point is always reached where reason must be called upon to perform its proper task. Sentiment, emotion and suggestion may enable one to soar unto the heights, but once arrived there, reason is a requisite, if any work is to be done.

### THE DANGER OF GROUP EMOTION

But it is usually dangerous to wait until one has been lifted to the heights. Sentiment, emotion and suggestion may, and too often do, immerse one into depths. Indeed, when one has by them been lifted unto the heights, one is in danger of being by these same forces plunged into the nethermost depths unless reason be quickly placed in charge of affairs. This, however, is an exceedingly difficult task for one who has yielded to group emotion. The impetus is usually too great to permit a reasonable degree of self-control. One is then like a passenger on a ship that is going full steam ahead, but without a pilot. Reason tells one that the ship is a mighty dangerous place to be in, but what can one do about it if one is in mid-ocean? And he who has been overwhelmed by

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

group emotion may not even be sensitive to any danger, so narrow are the dimensions to which group affect and social suggestion constrict the consciousness.

The lesson taught by a preceding chapter must not be forgotten here. One who participates in group sentiment will, if the group be a militant one, succumb to crowd paranoia. This means that, as far as the issues about which the group feels strongly are concerned, he will be literally paranoiac, unable, except with great difficulty, of entering into rational discourse about them.

Not even the most nobly inspired militant groups are entirely exempt from the corrosive influence of crowd paranoia. The psychology of all militant groups is the same; their law is the law of collective paranoia.

This should be a sufficient answer to those who propound the thesis that group emotion is essential to social progress. This thesis requires some qualification. Social progress connotes an ascent from the paranoiac to the rational — such is the movement of civilization. But group emotion seems inevitably to issue in the syndrome of collective paranoia. The latter does not exist in the group as such; it exists in the individuals who compose the group. Groups are paranoiac only in the

## *One Thing the Individual Might Do*

sense that their component individuals exhibit paranoiac traits with reference to certain issues. These individuals refuse to be rational in their outlook and their discourse upon the issues in question. These individuals would be and in fact are paranoiac with reference to these issues apart from membership in an organized militant group. But such affiliation accentuates the paranoiac attitude enormously, thanks to the fact that the individual in identifying himself with the group becomes oversensitive concerning its fate and fortunes. The group becomes his larger ego. This does not mean, as it is supposed to mean, that his personality enjoys expansion. On the contrary, affiliation with a group may, paradoxically enough, contract the personality. A person's egotism does not become altruism as a result of his entrance into the life of a group; his egotism often becomes more accentuated, more intolerable, his bigotry more unbearable. He feels swollen in importance after having joined a group. Surrounded by people who share his doctrines, his delusion of infallibility becomes more and more unshakeable. The enrollment of believers into an organized group is indeed in part a device for the overcoming, in a way other than rational, of all doubts concerning the beliefs involved.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

I am not inveighing against emotion and sentiment. I do not visualize an ideal life as without feeling. I do not even assert that all affects shall always be brought under rational control. But as a general rule they had better be, if only that our emotional life be made richer. It is more than superficial, it is stupid to assert that to bring emotion under the control of reason is to impoverish life. To speak of a rational life as one that excludes emotions is to speak in terms that are self-contradictory. A rational life, to the extent that it was rational, would, because it was rational, recognize the place and function of feeling. It would so order life as to make room for the positive unifying emotions, such as love, and leave much less room for negative affects like hatred and fear. Precisely because a life that is lived without reason is a life in which the negative and destructive feelings have as much the right of way as the positive and expansive ones, the emotional, irrational life will be found to exhibit a considerable degree of impoverishment.

### THE TRANSFERENCE OF FAITH

One of the things that has made it difficult for people to attain to a rational level has been their



## *One Thing the Individual Might Do*

misplaced faith. Faith has always been directed toward some object of belief, toward the content of some dogma, doctrine or creed, when it might better have been directed toward the most effectual method of knowledge-acquisition ever invented — the rational method.

This false allocation of faith has placed every believer at the mercy of doubt. For of course all believers doubt — the intensity of their believing, their fanaticism, their intolerance, their delusion of infallibility being evidence, not of faith, but of repressed doubt. When doubt is not resolved by reason, it persists, albeit in a repressed state — but it persists. Of course rational people doubt too. But they reduce internal mental conflict to a minimum, for the rational method involves a frank facing of doubt, not its suppression. And a doubt confessed and rationally treated is a doubt conquered.

And so the individual who would cultivate a more rational way of looking at social problems might proceed by effecting a transference of faith, disengaging it from its attachment to dogma, creed, doctrine, institution, constitution, leader, crowd, country, race, or party, and reposing it in the methods employed by science and philosophy. The history of science is a refutation of the myth

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

that final, absolute and dogmatic attitudes are essential to successful action in any field. They are not. Tentative hypotheses are all that is necessary for the direction and guidance of action. In fact, hypotheses are all that any one ever uses to guide his action with, a dogma being merely a hypothesis vested in a strong sense of certitude and a delusion of infallibility, both meant for the suppression of doubt.

What a vast economy would be effected if people acquired enough intellectual honesty to confess the tentative character of their ideas! An immense amount of conflict, internal mental and external social, might be prevented, and the transition from old to new and more adequate ideas made an easier and less painful operation. And not the least of the benefits of the method of reason would be the replacement of belief by knowledge.

## APPENDIX

### MALE MASOCHISM AND CULTURE\*

THERE is need for a more adequate description and evaluation of the role that male masochism has played as a maker of history. And this role has been a great one, far greater than anyone suspects. Masochism has at last come under scientific observation, but the number of scientists who have made it an object of study is rather small. Furthermore, whatever attention the subject has received has been directed almost exclusively to its medical aspects. Attention needs to be paid, however, to the anthropology and sociology of masochism — to the manner in which it has operated to give shape to a variety of human activities.

This chapter endeavors to furnish some notion of the manner in which male masochism seems to have infiltrated into cultural history. It will be freely granted that any of the phenomena herein described may turn out to be explicable in terms of

\* An expansion of an article published in the *Psychoanalytic Review*, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, January, 1936.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

a theory that excludes masochism. But this survey is intended to indicate that masochism must nevertheless stand under strong suspicion as a factor in the determination of certain classes of historical phenomena.

Male masochism is here defined as an impulsion in men toward the derivation of erotic pleasure from the domination, fancied or actual, of the feminine over the masculine.

Modern psychology, in recognition of the correlation of the sadistic and masochistic impulses, justifiably employs the term *sado-masochism*. But the peculiar contribution that male masochism appears to have made to history justifies a distinction, for the present purpose, between masochism and its compresent sadism, and also between male and female masochism. The latter seems also to have operated to give shape to history, and that in no inconsiderable way. The operations of male masochism, however, possess an intrinsic interest that justifies the special treatment it will receive here.

Religion, mythology, literature, art, philosophy, and social organization have in the past and continue in the present to exhibit certain features strongly suggestive of the operation of the male masochistic impulse.

It is not suggested that each of the phenomena

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

cited in this essay is a symptom of masochism. If this were the case, it would anyway lie beyond all possible demonstration. But the goal of this essay is not certitude. It will content itself with a probable theory. If, now, it is possible to cite a large number and variety of cases — works of art, literary products, religious rites, political, philosophical and religious ideas, social institutions — created or sustained by men, and symbolizing or giving expression to the idea of the dominant feminine, it will be plausible to assume that a goodly portion of them may very well be rooted in masochistic impulses. It could hardly be alleged that not one of the phenomena that will soon be cited could by any stretch of the imagination be conceived to be symptomatic of male masochism. The truth probably lies between an extreme negative position and one that should class all the phenomena in question as masochistic.

### THE MASOCHISTIC IDEAL

There is such a thing as masculine masochism, and there are such things as masochistic phantasies and ideals. The ideal of the male masochist is that of subservience to the female. He strives to realize this ideal, if not in actuality, then in phantasy. He strives to attain his goal, choosing as his medium



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

either a way of life, or a way of thinking, or both. Why may not the medium on occasion be a work of art, a literary composition, a religious rite, a philosophical, religious, social or political ideology, or a social institution? It is probable that masochists have made use of all these media. The masochist wishes to transform as much of life as is possible so as to make it conform to his perverted scale of values. He may therefore be expected to employ any and every instrument he can, to make over as many departments of life as he can gain control of. If it be asserted that religious rites and social institutions are the work of peoples, rather than individuals or minorities, the answer is that one must be prepared to find whole peoples possessed of sado-masochistic temperaments. There is evidence that such has indeed often been the case.

In order that the classification of any cultural object as masochistic be justified, it is not necessary to establish the masochism — in a strictly pathological sense — of its author. Almost every man is a bit of a masochist, and it is not improbable that practically every man experiences an occasional masochistic mood. Given a creative mind overtaken by such a mood, the latter may sustain itself long enough to make a permanent impression upon the created object.

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

Again, the reader is not to assume, when a cultural object is classed as masochistic, that it is meant to be regarded as solely or primarily such. The masochistic strain may be merely incidental and subordinate to the main theme. On the other hand, what in any given case appears to possess a masochistic quality may only simulate masochism. A definite decision one way or another is not always possible; one must rest content with probable judgments.

### MASOCHISM IN RELIGION

If the primitive goddess cults were not the creations of male masochism, they must have operated as powerful stimulants thereof. A dark hint of what may have been the chief rite of the cults at their most primitive stage is given by the human sacrifices made to the Greek goddess Bendis and the Hindu goddess Durga, also known as Uma, Parvati, Gauri, Kali, and Mahakali. The 1919 report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science contains an abstract of a paper by W. Crooke, *The Cults of the Mother Goddess in India*, in which mention is made of the blood sacrifice of male victims.

The most pronounced example of an apparently masochistic religion is the ancient Cybele

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

cult of Asia Minor. The ideology and the ritual of the cult appear to have been intensely masochistic. The priest's self-castration marked his appropriation by the goddess. The ideological hero of the rite was Attis. A tradition attached to the name described him as undergoing emasculation at the hands of the goddess Rhea. Augustine, in *The City of God*, alludes to Attis' castration by the mother of the gods. And Catullus' *Attis* is a masochistic phantasy in verse. The poem, in its depiction of the hero's surrender to Cybele, his revolt, and his decisive defeat at her hands, patterns itself along masochistic lines — the conception of a revolt that is doomed to defeat is exactly suited to the masochistic taste. The locus of the cult — Asia Minor — is an argument in favor of its masochistic character, for, as will be seen, this peninsula seems in ancient times to have been a very hot-bed of masochism.

The castration-rite, according to A. G. Francis, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1926, was a feature of the following cults: Cybele, in Phrygia; Hecate, in Stratonicea in Caria; Artemis, in Ephesus; Atargatis, in Hierapolis-Bambyce; Astarte, in Syrian Hierapolis; Aphrodite, in Cyprus; Osiris, in Egypt; and Berecynthia, in Augustudunum in Gaul.

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

Pausanias refers to the flagellation of Spartan boys before the image of a goddess. In the same sentence he mentions the flagellation of women at the Sciereia, a Dionysian festival held at Alea.

Seventeenth and eighteenth century France and England witnessed the birth and death of a religion with a sado-masochistic taint, in the shape of the French prophets movement, described by Theodore Schroeder in *The Psychoanalytic Review* of January, 1925, in an article entitled *A Contribution to the Psychology of Theism — The French Prophets and John Lacy*. The rites of this bizarre religion required the mutual exchange of violence between the sexes.

### MASOCHISTIC MYTHS

If mythology be constituted, in part at least, of wish-fulfillment phantasies that assume macro-cosmic proportions, one may expect to discover male masochism contributing its share to the mythus of the ancients. A masochistic religious cult would of course have its mythus, but aside from that, the mythopoeic quality that masochism is so well-known for would assure a liberal and independent supply of suitable tales. The masochist has his personal fancies, but the era of

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

mythology was a period of socially-shared phantasies of a certain type. The masochistic myths may have been original tales, or perhaps elaborations or graftings upon stories already extant. Conceivably a masochistic myth-maker might enter at some point in the history of a tale to impose a new quality upon it. The Herakles story may have undergone such an experience — the Omphale element (with Asia Minor its locus) may be a masochistic intercalation. The Greek masochist could hardly be expected to forego the voluptuous satisfaction to be derived from the portrayal of Herakles, symbol of masculine physical strength, in the role of the subject of a masochistic phantasy. A similar motivation may be responsible for the Samson-Delilah story and the Hindu story of Arjuna and the women who offer him and his band of men the choice of death or slavery. This same motivation may indeed lie behind the ever-popular stories of subordination to feminine will that so often attach themselves to the names, not only of prominent men, but of the most obscure male leaders and executives of every kind.

The Greeks had other myths distinguished for their strong masochistic flavor. There was the myth of Atalante, warrior, huntress, wrestler and athlete whom Swinburne, that masochistic poet,



## *Male Masochism and Culture*

found so fascinating. Then there were the stories of the husband-killing daughters of Danaos and women of Lemnos — note that Lemnos was the place where human sacrifices were offered to the goddess Bendis. The Lemnos story is to be found in Statius' *Thebaid*. Were the story and the sacrifices in any way related?

The masochistic aspiration often takes the form of an ideal society, ideal from a masculine masochistic viewpoint, of course. This matter will be taken up a little later, when the subject of gynarchies is reached. Here it will suffice to note the existence in past androcratic societies of a type of myth which may or may not hark back to a more primitive gynarchy. The myth is that of feminine armies, exemplified among the Greeks by the Amazons, and among the Teutons by the Idisi and the Valkyries. Florence Mary Bennett's booklet, *Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons* suggests that the latter may have been real. They might have been women warriors of ancient gynarchies in Greece and its environing countries. It is significant for my hypothesis that, according to Bennett, the Amazons were regarded as the votaries of Artemis and Cybele, and that they were the supposed founders of the Ephesian temple of Artemis.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

Mention of the Amazons and their pantheon recalls Asia Minor and its strange significance for the theme of this writing. In any discourse concerning the influence of masochism upon the ancient world, special reference must be made to Asia Minor. This peninsula seems to have been a radiating point for masochistic influence. It was the locale for the cults of Rhea, Bendis, Cybele and Artemis. It was on the Asiatic shores of the Black Sea that the Amazons were depicted as setting up their realm. Smyrna is said to be named after one of their goddesses or generals. The Amazons are pictured as wearers of the Phrygian cap — Phrygia was one of the kingdoms of Asia Minor. In the Herakles myth, Omphale is ruler of another Asia Minor kingdom — Lydia. The Semiramis myth, to be mentioned later, was popular on the peninsula. Havelock Ellis reports a curious courtship custom that once prevailed in the Caucasus. A man courting a woman would retire to a solitary place in the country, to be followed by the woman armed with a whip. If he survived the lash, he was privileged to marry her.

Note should be made of the fact that Ephesus, Asia Minor, was a center for the worship of Diana (Artemis), and, with the rise of Christianity, of that of the Virgin Mary.

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

A curious coincidence may be noted in passing. From Asia Minor there emigrated, in or before the fourteenth century, a Jewish sect known as the Karaites. It went northwest, a portion settling in the Polish city of Lemberg. Four or five centuries later, there was born in that city a Jew named Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, the eponym of negative algolagnia.

So much for Asia Minor.

Southwestern Asia told a tale in ancient times of lovers who were crippled or buried alive or otherwise put to death. This tale was associated with the names of Ishtar and Semiramis. The latter figures in legend as a mighty conqueror. The legend is found written down in Diodorus Siculus. Significantly enough, one myth describes her as a daughter of Atargatis, whose rites resembled those of Cybele. A. H. Sayce, in the *English Historical Review* in 1888, suggested the possible identity of Semiramis and Smyrna.

Ishtar's sadism receives symbolical representation in the Gilgamesh epic.

The myth of the woman-conquered hero is well known. The stories of Samson and Delilah, Herakles and Omphale, Merlin and Vivian, Isis and Amon Ra are representative. The tale usually subsists in a complete form. That is to say, the

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

story progresses up to at least the point where the hero, hitherto free, comes under feminine domination. An exception is furnished by the Siegfried-Brunhild myth.

The Brunhild legend bears a resemblance to that of Atalante. Brunhild is possessed of great strength. She engages men in games, and her victory has fatal consequences for her opponent. That the account of Brunhild's treatment of Gunther on their wedding night carries a special appeal to the masochist is proved by Sacher-Masoch's reference to it in his *Venus in Furs*. Nor is the story of the encounter between Siegfried and Brunhild lacking in interest for the masochist. Siegfried is almost conquered, but issues victorious in the end. Teuton masculinism supervenes here to prescribe a limit to male masochism. As a result, the masochist myth appears here in truncated form. It fails to reach its apex. German masculinism wins the day, and the hero triumphs over his feminine opponent.

Concerning the Valkyries, one account of them terms them the wound-givers. The myth of the Valkyries may have been a memory of primitive Teuton feminine warriors, themselves perhaps a cause or effect, or both, of a possible primitive Teuton masculine masochism. A tradi-

tion of feminine warriors would be likely to furnish inspiration to a masochistic myth-maker.

The Icelandic female Maras, or nightmare spirits, deserve mention here. The folk-tale of Vanland, who is done to death by one of them, carries a powerful appeal to the masochist. Masochistic dreams in which the Maras figured must have been common among Norsemen, for there was an ecclesiastical law prescribing outlawry or a fine for the woman proved guilty of being a Mara and riding a man or his servants. This law was in a class with a Norse statute imposing a fine of three marks on any troll-woman convicted of a similar offense.

A reference to a few other apparently masochistic myths is in place here. There is the myth of the Irish war-goddess, Badb-catha (battle crow) who tore the bodies of the slain. And there is also that of Yuki-onne, the Japanese snow-woman, who contracts marriages with men that are fatal to them. Then there are the Rakshasas and Churels, both species of Hindu Amazon or Mara. There is also the Jewish myth of Lilith. Perhaps the story of Circe ought to be numbered among the masochistic myths.

Attention must now be drawn to a curious set of myths, all of which seem to share the same



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

theme. The myths are those of Omphale, who deprives Herakles of his club and lion's mane; Delilah, who shears Samson's hair and causes him to lose his strength; Vivian, who makes Merlin cut off his beard; Judith, who decapitates Holofernes; Jael, who drives a tent-pin through Sisera's temple; Semiramis, who decapitates her lovers — consult Diodorus Siculus; Salome, who has John the Baptist beheaded; and Rhea, who castrates Attis. It may be possible that all these stories, except the last, are variants or symbolic representations of a primitive castration myth or myths, of which the last-named would be one. Rhea is identical to Cybele, whose votaries practised self-castration. Omphale may be a substitute for Rhea. Note that Herakles puts on feminine garments, as did the worshippers of Cybele.

The theory that is here being outlined is not in the least exclusive of that which regards the war-goddess and warrior-women tales as memorials of actual primitive feminine armies. If there were such armies, it is simply inconceivable that they could have failed to generate and perpetuate a sadomasochistic atmosphere. Nor could this state of affairs fail to be reflected in an appropriate mythology.

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

### MASOCHISM IN ART

As might have been expected, a masochistic mythus has furnished the cues for a masochistic art. Perhaps masochism can explain the persistent recurrence in art of the Omphale, Circe, Valkyrie, Delilah, Salome, Amazon, Medusa, and similar themes.

Before proceeding any further, it is necessary to utter a word of caution. The inclusion, in this writing, of the name of any artist or writer is not to be construed as his definite classification as a masochist, nor of his work as definitely and indisputably masochistic. In any given case, he and his work may or may not fall under that classification. But it is not being presumptuous to assert that, given a substantially large number of works of art, literary productions, and systems of thought that exhibit the essential features of masochist reverie, some of them are likely to be exactly that: masochistic reverie in artistic, literary, pseudo-philosophical or pseudo-scientific form; and the creators of these are likely to be masochists. It is extremely unlikely that none of the creators and none of their creations would be so classifiable. The theory, in other words, rests upon a probability assumption. It is highly probable that some

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

of the creators and some of their creations fall in the category in question, even though, in a given case, it may never be possible to come to a definite decision.

The Pompeian mural, depicting the death of Pentheus at the hands of his mother Agave and two other women, a reproduction of which is to be found in the first volume of Gray and MacCulloch's *Mythology of all Races*, may very well be a portrayal of a masochistic phantasy. It is significant that the picture contains two Maenads hovering in the background, brandishing whips and torches. The Maenads were women closely associated with the Cybele cult.

The nineteenth-century British painter, Sir Edward Burne-Jones, may or may not have been a masochist, but no masochist can complain of Sir Edward's taste in subjects for his pictures. Here is a bit of the Burne-Jones gallery: *Beguiling of Merlin*, *Merlin and Nimue* (Vivian), *The Enchantments of Nimue*, *Circe*, *Wine of Circe*, *The Depths of the Sea*, *The Wheel of Fortune*, *Sidonia von Bork*. The Gorgons appear in several of his works. The reader is invited to inspect the gallery for himself. *Sidonia von Bork* is a character in a novel, *Sidonia the Sorceress*, by a Swiss named Wilhelm Meinhold. This masochistically tinted novel

## Male Masochism and Culture

aroused the enthusiasm of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a friend of Burne-Jones. At least three of Rossetti's paintings are devoted to themes not displeasing to masochistic tastes: *Astarte Syriaca*, *Lady Lilith*, *Lygea Syren* (Sea Spell). He wrote a poem, *The Wine of Circe*, dedicated to Burne-Jones' picture. More about Rossetti anon.

### MASOCHISM IN LITERATURE

The very word *masochism* attests to the influence exerted on literature by the type of impulsions to which it has reference, the term being derived from Sacher-Masoch, the author of *Venus in Furs*, the best known of all masochistic romances.

There are other such romances, of course. Mario Praz, in *The Romantic Agony*, dwells at great length on the evolution of the masochistic romance in nineteenth century French and English literature.

Catullus' *Attis* and the Lemnos story in Statius' *Thebaid* have already received mention. There are masochistic lines in Propertius' *Cynthia*. Greek masochists must have blessed Aristophanes for his *Lysistrata*, and also perhaps for his *Ecclesiazusae*. A Greek theme inspired Adolph von Kleist in the writing of his *Penthesilea*. Penthesilea's sadism

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

assumes a character that constrains Kleist from portraying her deeds upon the stage, compelling him to resort to indirection. Mention has already been made of Wilhelm Meinhold's *Sidonia the Sorceress*.

Thomas Otway's tragedy, *Venice Preserved*, contains, in addition to two distinctly masochistic scenes, the following lines:

"Come, lead me forward now like a tame lamb  
To sacrifice, thus in his fatal garlands,  
Deck'd fine and pleas'd, the wanton skips  
and plays,  
Trots by the enticing flattering priestess side,  
And much transported with his little pride,  
Forgets his dear companions of the plain  
Till by her, bound, hee's on the altar layn  
Yet then too hardly bleats, such pleasure's  
in the pain."

No doubt attaches to the masochistic quality of some of Swinburne's poetry. There is no mistaking the character of *Laus Veneris*, *Chastelard*, and *Masque of Queen Bersabe*.

To the list of possibly masochistic works may be added Heine's *Diana* and Frederick Hebbel's *Judith and Holofernes*. There are masochistic scenes and allusions in Strindberg's *Countess Julie*



## Male Masochism and Culture

and *Dance of Death*; *The Father* may belong to the category of masochistic literature.

It may be, and yet it may not be a coincidence that the poet who wrote *Merlin* also wrote *Sisera*. Both of these poems of Edward Arlington Robinson possess a content pleasing to the masochist. *Merlin* indeed is laden with masochistic phrases to the point of weariness.

There is a point where masochistic fancy takes on a deeper and sicklier hue and becomes what looks like paranoid phantasy. This is the point where the opposite sex is envisaged as endowed with the three attributes of omnipotence, invincibility, and extreme malignancy. Two or three illustrations from literature will suffice. In Dante Gabriel Rossetti's poem, *Eden Bower*, one finds a theme dear to the hearts of male masochists:

*"Is not the foe-God weak as the foeman  
When love grows hate in the heart of a  
woman?"*

The foe-God is God, foe of Lilith, lover of Adam. Lilith must have had a special fascination for Rossetti; he translated Goethe's apparently masochistic poem by that name.

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

A bit of masochistic tripe similar to the above is found in Rufus Dawes' *Geraldine*:

"... — *when the soul  
Is once corrupt, with passion unassuaged,  
What can a female hurricane control?*"

This recalls Kipling's "Hell knows no fury like a woman scorned."

To the category of masochistic literature may also be added the mass of writings on Cleopatra, Madame de Pompadour, Lola Montez, Messalina and similar creatures. Some of this literature undoubtedly represents genuine biography and history, but a goodly proportion is better classified as masochist mythology.

If the observant reader will place himself on the lookout, he will spot masochistic scenes, themes and allusions in many a novel, short story, poem, play, moving picture, comic strip, and witticism.

### SOCIAL MASOCHISM

The masochism that has hitherto occupied the attention of psychologists is individual masochism. This is the masochism of particular individuals in their subordinate relation, fancied or real, to particular members of the opposite sex. But there appears to be a social masochism. This involves the subordinate relation, fancied or real, of a number

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

of individuals of the same sex, taken collectively, to a number of individuals of the opposite sex, taken collectively, or of all the members of either sex in a subordinate relation, fancied or real, to the other sex. Social masochism has, strangely enough, received little or no attention. This essay is, in part, an attempt to establish the reality of this kind of masochism.

The masochistic aspiration often takes the form of a vision of an ideal society, ideal from a masochistic viewpoint, of course. This is significant for the interpretation of such myths and religious cults as have already been referred to, and the structure of certain primitive and contemporary societies. It is an interesting speculation whether any of the gynarchies and goddess-cults were conceived, brought into being, and sustained by masochistic men — or sadistic women. The Egyptian gynocracy is said to have been established by a man — King Sesostris. Was he a masochist? Frazer attributes the primitive gynarchies to the perception of the importance of woman for the continuance of life. But did not androcratic societies have this same perception? Then why were they not gynarchic?

At any rate, whatever may have been the origin of gynocracy, the latter must have operated as a

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

breeder of masochism. If male masochism was not the cause of gynarchy, it may very well have been a consequence thereof. A gynarchy is probably a large-scale producer of male masochism. Once generated, the latter will in its turn serve to sustain the gynarchy, as female masochism probably bred by androcracy, serves to maintain the latter.

Certain it is that gynarchies have in fact exhibited phenomena calculated to enter into full accord with the aspirations of male masochists. Some of these phenomena have been recorded by the Vaertings in their book, *The Dominant Sex*. This book, like practically all writings on sex conflicts and sex dominance, takes no account whatsoever of the fact and the psychology of sado-masochism — an index of that strange inability so many writers on social topics reveal to give due attention to psychological factors. But the book does contain a store of valuable information, and some of the phenomena it describes certainly lend themselves to interpretation via the masochistic hypothesis.

The marital relation lends itself to masochistic uses under any scheme of social organization, including an androcratic one. No one knows how often a dominant wife is really the creation and the instrument of a masochistic husband — it is

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

not at all unlikely that such is often the case. On the other hand, the wish being father to the thought, a masochistic man will often ascribe a dominant position to his or someone else's wife, lover or mistress, when the true position is really one of equipollence or subordination. Rumor, gossip and report are often species of phantasy.

### MASOCHISTIC MYTHS OF TODAY

It has been seen that in the ancient world individual masochistic phantasies became generalized into socially shared ideas. They entered into, became part of the mythus of a race or nation. The mythologies of the ancient world have in large part gone, but masochism has persisted, and masochism must have its mythus, social as well as individual. Krafft-Ebing and other writers on the subject stress the individual mythus. It is contended here that masochists also have their socially shared mythology.

The world today is not without its stock of socially shared masochistic myths — phantasies held by male masochists everywhere, and by those who come under their influence. Indeed, the mythology in question has become a source of revenue, and with all educational agencies utilized by the myth-peddlers, the myths are becoming the



## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

property of both masochists and non-masochists, men and women. The myths masquerade as philosophy, psychology, sociology, biology, educational theory, and schemes of social reform. Their most common characteristics are an imaginary magnification of feminine power, a correlative imaginary depreciation of masculine power, an imaginative depiction of woman as the savior of mankind (Goethe's "The Woman-Soul leadeth us upward and on;" see also E. A. Robinson's *Merlin* and Auguste Comte's *System of Positive Polity*), and an aspiration toward some kind of gynarchic social order or way of life. At times the phantasies take on a distinctly paranoid character, women being envisaged as designing, conspiring, invincible Vivians, Circes and Delilahs.

All this mythopoesis issues in certain familiar pictures of "reality," "life," and "love." In these pictures an omnipotent womanhood carries on all kinds of transactions with a powerless manhood. The phraseology is familiar — woman is the seat of power; the source of life; the conserver of life; the keeper of all ideals, all wisdom, all morality, all practicality, all culture; she is the fount and origin of all that is good; she is the one great constructive force; her practically infallible instincts and intuitions facilitate an instant grasp of the

## *Male Masochism and Culture*

greatest truths of life, truths that men laboriously strive to attain, truths some of which are utterly beyond masculine ken; woman's function is to govern, man's but to obey; she is anyhow the ruler, androcracy being but a delusion; she is the center of the home and its ruler; outside of the home her power is equally great, men of importance being merely the instruments of their wives, mothers, daughters, sisters, mistresses, private secretaries, office assistants, or wise and inspiring feminine friends; the greatest revolution of all time is at hand: women will soon take matters in hand and transform life in all its departments; and so on, and so on, ad infinitum, ad nauseam.

It is not asserted that all this is manufactured solely by male masochists. Plenty of it flows out of feminine minds, and a good deal out of male minds that are either neurotic, or ignorant, or adolescent, or afflicted with a particularly morbid form of gyneolatry. There is a tendency, present in its most virulent form in neurotics of both sexes, toward the imaginative magnification of the power of the opposite sex. The idea of feminine, or masculine power, becomes emotionally charged. It thereupon looms larger and larger in consciousness until all perspective is lost and a rational comparative evaluation of the relative power and in-

## *Social Forces in Personality-Stunting*

fluence of the sexes becomes well-nigh impossible.

A reporter who must have been something of a psychoanalyst, while interviewing a male prophet of the "coming" feminine revolution, inquired of him concerning his childhood relation to his mother. In answer, the prophet, who has turned his gynophilia into a source of income, described his mother as exercising an unusual dominance over him as a child.

Masochism may enter into the makeup of a certain type of male, often of mystic temperament, with an adolescent notion of women as in some sense divine, exuding love and possessed of infallible intuitions, revealing "truths" greater and more profound than any mediated by mere science and philosophy, and who can solve all his problems for man, if he will only submit to her rule. This kind of male, for all his babble about the gynarchic future, in reality lives in the past, the gynarchic past. It is the gynarchy he wants to restore, albeit in a refined form.

Gynocracy of one sort or another has had and still has its pseudo - philosophical and pseudo-scientific defenders. Perhaps the best known of these is Auguste Comte, whose brief in the fourth chapter of his *System of Positive Polity* is one of the most curious and adolescent pieces of writing

in the history of philosophy. The names of some living men would be in place here. The reader, if he will keep a sharp lookout on books, newspapers, magazines, and lecture announcements, can supply these names himself.

In closing, it is essential to note that it is not sought to maintain that male masochism has been the sole and exclusive cause of any or all of the phenomena cited herein. It may in any given case have been merely a collaborative factor. It is well to avoid a dogmatic and exclusive attitude in behalf of this or any rival hypothesis. Thus, it might be asserted that the Omphale-Herakles interlude receives a simple and less bizarre explanation than the one offered here: Herakles' thralldom is simply an expiation of his crime. But would anyone not a masochist be as likely to conceive the form the expiation took? Again, the Herakles and Samson and similar tales may be variants of the sun-god theme — the sun is overcome by winter. But why do these stories assume a form so accommodating to the masochist wish? Or it might be said, with Frazer, that the Cybele cult had an agricultural significance — it was a device to assure the fertility of the soil. But would anyone not a masochist be likely to hit upon such a means of improving agriculture?





## INDEX OF NAMES

---

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Adam, 237<br/> Addams, Jane, 150<br/> Adler, Alfred, 31<br/> Agave, 234<br/> Alexander the Great, 117<br/> Amon Ra, 229<br/> Anaxagoras, 174, 191<br/> Anselm, 99<br/> Aphrodite, 224<br/> Aristophanes, 235<br/> Arjuna, 226<br/> Artemis, 224, 227, 228<br/> Astarte, 224, 235<br/> Atalante, 226, 230<br/> Atargatis, 224, 229<br/> Attis, 224, 232<br/> Augustine, St., 52, 53, 224<br/> Aurelius, Marcus, 174, 191<br/> Averroes, 191<br/> Avicenna, 191</p> <p>Badb-Catha, 231<br/> Baez, Cecilio, 101, 102<br/> Balfour, David, 167, 174, 191<br/> Bealer, Lewis W., 100, 101, 102<br/> Bendis, 223, 227, 228<br/> Benes, Eduard, 167, 174, 192<br/> Bennett, Florence Mary, 227<br/> Berdyayev, N. A., 154<br/> Berecynthia, 224</p> | <p>Bleuler, Eugen, 31<br/> Boethius, 191<br/> Bonpland, 102<br/> Brunhild, 230<br/> Burne-Jones, Sir Edward, 234, 235</p> <p>Catullus, 224, 235<br/> Circe, 231, 233, 234, 235<br/> Cleopatra, 238<br/> Comstock, Anthony, 52<br/> Comte, Auguste, 242, 244<br/> Confucius, 99, 174, 191<br/> Crooke, W., 223<br/> Curie, Mme. Marie, 150<br/> Cybele, 133, 224, 227, 228, 229, 232, 234, 245</p> <p>Danaos, 227<br/> Dawes, Rufus, 237<br/> Delilah, 226, 229, 232, 233<br/> Dewey, John, 115, 136, 179<br/> Diana, 228<br/> Diodorus Siculus, 229, 232<br/> Durga, 223</p> <p>Eddington, Sir A. S., 136<br/> Edmunds, Sterling E., 66<br/> Einstein, Albert, 136<br/> Ellis, Havelock, 228<br/> Engelbrecht, H. C., 66</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## *Index of Names*

- |                                    |                                  |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Fichte, J. G., 120, 121, 122       | Jael, 232                        |
| Francia, Jose de, 100, 101, 102    | John the Baptist, 232            |
| Francis, A. G., 224                | Judith, 232                      |
| Franklin, Benjamin, 102            | Kali, 223                        |
| Frazer, J. G., 125, 240, 245       | Karaites, the, 229               |
| Frederick the Great, 117           | Keynes, J. M., 179               |
| Freud, Sigmund, 136, 179           | Kipling, Rudyard, 238            |
|                                    | Kleist, Adolf von, 235, 236      |
| Gauri, 223                         | Krafft-Ebing, 241                |
| Gautama, 99                        | Kropotkin, Peter, 66             |
| Gilgamesh, 229                     |                                  |
| Gillespie, R. D., 31               | Lacy, John, 225                  |
| Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 237       | La Follette, Robert M., 192      |
| Gray, L. H., 234                   | Laski, H. J., 171, 173, 174, 179 |
| Gunther, 230                       | Lea, H. C., 66, 97, 98, 99, 100  |
|                                    | Leibnitz, G. W., 191             |
| Haldane, Lord R. B., 167, 174, 191 | Lewin, Kurt, 164                 |
| Hanighen, F. C., 66                | Lilith, 231, 235, 237            |
| Hebbel, Frederick, 236             | Lincoln, Abraham, 101            |
| Hecate, 224                        | Lippitt, Ronald, 164             |
| Hegel, G. W. F., 115               | Lippmann, Walter, 93             |
| Heine, Heinrich, 236               | Locke, John, 191                 |
| Henderson, D. K., 31               | Lysistrata, 235                  |
| Heracles, 226, 228, 229, 232, 245  | MacCulloch, J. A., 234           |
| Heraclitus, 188                    | Mahakali, 223                    |
| Hitler, Adolf, 210                 | Maimonides, 99                   |
| Hollingworth, H. L., 31            | Mann, Thomas, 136                |
| Holofernes, 232                    | Marriott, Sir John, 200          |
|                                    | Masaryk, T. G., 167, 174, 192    |
| Ishtar, 133, 229                   | Masefield, John, 136             |
| Isis, 133, 229                     | Medusa, 233                      |
|                                    | Mead, 95                         |
| Jesus, 99                          | Meinhold, Wilhelm, 234, 236      |
|                                    | Merlin, 229, 232, 234            |

## *Index of Names*

- Messalina, 238  
Mill, John Stuart, 167, 174,  
191  
Millay, Edna St. Vincent,  
150  
Montessori, Maria, 150  
Montez, Lola, 238  
Myers, Gustavus, 66
- Napoleon, 102  
Nichols, Beverley, 139, 140,  
141, 145  
Nietzsche, F., 15, 115  
Nightingale, Florence, 150
- Omphale, 226, 228, 229, 232,  
233, 245  
Osiris, 224  
Otway, Thomas, 236
- Pareto, V., 109, 110  
Parmenides, 191  
Parvati, 223  
Paul, 132  
Pausanias, 225  
Pentheus, 234  
Penthesilia, 235  
Pericles, 174, 191  
Peter the Great, 117  
Plato, 99, 120, 121, 169  
Pompadour, Mme. de, 238  
Praz, Mario, 235  
Propertius, 235
- Rhea, 224, 228, 232  
Roback, A. A., 15, 25, 71
- Robinson, Edward Arling-  
ton, 237, 242  
Roehm, E., 210  
Rossetti, Dante Gabriel, 235,  
237  
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 192  
Russell, Bertrand, 24, 136,  
179
- Sacher-Masoch, Leopold von  
229, 230, 235  
Salome, 232, 233  
Samson, 226, 229, 232, 245  
Santayana, George, 136  
Sayce, A. H., 229  
Schlapp, Max, 192  
Schroeder, Theodore, 24, 33,  
51, 225  
Schuman, F. L., 66  
Seldes, George, 66  
Semiramis, 228, 229, 232  
Seneca, 191  
Sesostris, 239  
Shaw, George Bernard, 23  
Sibelius, Jan, 136  
Sidonia von Bork, 234  
Siegfried, 230  
Sisera, 232  
Smith, Alfred E., 192  
Smuts, Jan Christiaan, 167,  
174, 192  
Smyrna, 228, 229  
Socrates, 99  
Spinoza, Baruch, 99  
Stalin, Joseph, 210  
Statius, 227, 235  
Strindberg, J. A., 236

## *Index of Names*

- |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Swinburne, Algernon, 227,<br>236 | Vagts, Alfred, 66                 |
| Thomson, Lord, 185               | Vanland, 231                      |
| Tiltman, H. H., 66               | Virgin Mary, 228                  |
| Trotsky, Leon, 210               | Vivian, 229, 232, 234             |
| Trumbull, 52                     | Whipple, Leon, 66                 |
| Uma, 223                         | Wilgus, A. Curtis, 24, 66,<br>100 |
| Vaertings, 141, 240              | Wilson, Woodrow, 204              |
|                                  | Yuki-onne, 231                    |

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

---

- Absolutism, 113, 114, 210
- Algolagnia, 229
- Altruism, 54, 55, 92, 93, 94,  
101, 130, 133, 215
- Amazons, the, 227, 228, 233
- Anarchy, 103, 210
- Androcracy, 40, 107, 124, 125,  
127, 132-138, 145, 146,  
148, 149, 239, 240, 243
- Androphobia, 129
- Anger, 44
- Anthropophagy, 30, 65
- Ardor, moral, 41
- Aristocracy, 12, 13, 64, 72,  
81, 85
- Art, 23
- Autocracy, 38, 49, 50, 58, 62,  
63, 74, 84, 112, 113, 126,  
127, 134, 142, 143, 150-  
155
- Autocratic principle, 28
- Barbarism, 36
- Behavior, 19, 106  
infantile, 24  
crowd, 36
- Birth-control, 162
- Business, 64, 65
- Capacity, 154
- Censorship, 49, 51, 55, 58,  
77, 208
- Chivalry, 138
- Churels, the, 231
- Class, 35, 38, 128
- Clique, 35, 38
- Clubs, 71, 165
- Commodities, 89
- Competition, 12, 20, 38, 58,  
62, 63, 84, 109, 110, 112,  
115
- Conflict, 38, 52, 53, 54, 107,  
109, 198, 199, 210
- Conscripts, 150
- Conspiracies, 33, 36
- Consumer, the, 89
- Contempt, 129, 130, 138, 141,  
143
- Co-operation, 77, 115, 155,  
165, 173
- Corruption, 109
- Courts, the, 196
- Courtship, 228
- Crime, 65, 108
- Crises, social, 38
- Criticism, imperviousness  
to, 31, 104
- Crowds, 35, 37, 38, 39, 162,  
186
- Crusaders, 23, 54
- Cults, 223, 224, 227, 228, 234,  
239
- Culture, 13, 40, 56, 76, 78,  
80-83, 85, 117, 136, 156,  
161, 219  
definition of, 13



## *Index of Subjects*

- Day-dreams, 24  
Delusions, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38,  
44, 45, 72, 149, 171, 177,  
182, 208, 243  
Democracy, 115, 126, 150,  
151, 152, 155, 158, 159,  
164, 171, 189, 210  
definition of, 13  
Democratic principle, the,  
27  
Depression, economic, 108  
Dictators, 24, 71, 74, 103,  
113, 120, 122, 177, 189,  
190, 200, 209  
Dictatorship, 209, 210, 211  
Divorce, 141  
Dogmatism, 36, 177  
Dominance, 141, 142, 149,  
240  
Doubt, 47-51, 217, 218  
  
Ecclesiasticism, 64, 65  
Economy, biological, 125  
Educability, 163  
Education, 26, 27, 61, 67, 96,  
142, 147, 159, 162, 163,  
164, 212  
Efficiency, 60, 88, 142, 143,  
145  
Egomania, 32  
Egotism, 20, 31, 54, 55, 91,  
94, 101, 127, 215  
Emotionality, 39, 81, 147,  
213, 214, 215  
Environment, 27, 151, 186  
Ethics, 103  
Etiquette assumption, 93, 94  
  
Eugenics, 23, 162  
Evil, 21, 37  
Experience, 68, 167, 169, 176  
Experiment, 43, 46, 51, 71,  
179, 182, 184, 192, 199,  
200  
Exploitation, 11, 15, 30, 31,  
38, 58, 62, 63, 66, 74, 84,  
88, 91, 109-115, 121, 134,  
159, 160  
Exploiters, 30, 63, 77, 79, 90,  
116, 118  
Factions, 208, 209  
Faith, 41, 42, 44, 47, 49, 99,  
217  
Family, the, 59, 74, 141, 150,  
151, 152, 164  
Fanaticism, 50, 104, 123  
Fear, 32, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47,  
50, 51, 128, 129, 130, 138,  
141, 143, 188, 208  
Flagellation, 225  
Forces, social, 107, 108, 109  
Freedom, 28, 49, 50, 54, 76,  
77, 121, 161  
Genius, 69, 81, 179  
Gorgons, the, 234  
Government, 89, 91, 120, 134,  
148, 159, 160, 168, 194-  
197, 201, 203, 205  
Greatness, 71, 116, 117, 118  
Growth, of personality, 27,  
28, 30, 56, 60, 63, 70, 71,  
80, 86, 113, 116, 118, 131,  
143, 149, 155, 156-163,  
207, 210

## *Index of Subjects*

- Gynarchy, 40, 107, 136, 227, 239, 240, 244
- Gyneolatry, 243
- Gynocracy, 124-127, 132, 133, 141, 244
- Gynophilia, 244
- Hatred, 129, 130, 138, 143, 170
- Heroes, 93, 94, 103, 119
- Historiography, 92, 102, 106
- History, 14, 18, 40, 66, 93, 101, 113, 117, 118, 124, 154, 170, 218, 219, 220  
as learning process, 20  
interpretation of, 14, 85, 86, 127, 134
- Homicide, 32
- Ideas, 48
- Idisi, the, 227
- Ignorance, 19, 20
- Immaturity —  
emotional, 11, 26  
intellectual, 11, 26, 32  
psychological, 11, 13, 14, 23-30, 38-42, 45, 47, 48, 51-57, 59-61, 64, 67, 81-88, 91, 94, 104, 108, 114, 115, 126, 138, 153, 160, 162, 201, 207  
volitional, 11, 26
- Imperialism, 20
- Industriousness, 96
- Infallibility, delusion of, 32, 33, 36, 42, 45, 48, 61, 104, 147, 176, 189, 201, 215,
- Inferiority, 31, 63, 64, 129, 133, 149, 171, 179
- Inquisition, the, 98
- Insight, 20, 184
- Instinct, 180, 181, 182, 186, 189, 242
- Institutions —  
social, 19, 26, 27, 29, 43, 75, 76, 84, 86, 91, 106, 111, 126, 127, 157, 158, 189, 222  
economic, 57, 76, 77, 87, 91, 100, 125, 151, 156  
political, 57, 76, 77, 87, 151, 156  
military, 57, 76, 77, 91, 156  
ecclesiastical, 76, 77, 92  
ecclesiastical, 76, 77, 92  
sacred, 157
- Intellection, 67, 68
- Intelligence, 60, 61, 132, 145, 148, 159, 167, 168, 173, 180, 191-194, 201, 208
- Interpretation, telic, 105
- Intolerance, 12, 25, 33, 36, 41-43, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 58, 103, 105, 115, 176, 208
- Intuition, 180, 183-186, 189, 242
- Inventions, 15
- "isms", 25
- Jealousy, 59
- Knowledge, 181, 182, 183, 187, 218

## *Index of Subjects*

- Labor, child, 95, 96, 162
- Laws, 19, 89
- Leadership, 32
- Levels, of existence, 12, 13,
  - 38, 39, 56, 57, 59, 68, 70,
  - 75, 76, 80, 84, 88-91, 95,
  - 112, 114, 115, 118, 165,
  - 207, 211
- Logic, 68, 146, 147, 170, 180, 188
- Love, 26, 58, 61
  - conjugal, 59, 143
  - parental, 59, 60, 61
- Maenads, the, 234
- Maras, the, 231
- Masochism, 40, 107, 138-141,
  - 143, 148, 219-245
  - definition of, 220
  - in religion, 223-225
  - in mythology, 225-232
  - in art, 233-235
  - in literature, 235-238
  - social, 238-241
- Masses, the, 69, 72, 74, 90
- Maturation, 15, 17, 30, 63,
  - 80, 81, 112, 157, 161, 163
- Maturity, psychological, 13,
  - 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29,
  - 31, 42, 47, 48, 54-57, 60,
  - 70, 71, 78, 81, 83, 86, 88,
  - 95, 105, 106, 108, 112-
  - 116, 138, 153, 155, 160,
  - 207
- civic, 23
- physical, 17, 18, 26
- sexual, 52
- Megalomania, 32, 33, 189
- Messiahs, 37
- Method, scientific, 174, 175,
  - 176, 184, 217
- Mind, growth of, 17
- Misogyny, 128, 129, 130
- Morality, 55
- Morals, 15, 67
- Morbidity, psychological,
  - 102
- Mores, 19, 112, 130
- Mummery, 140
- Mysticism, 20
- Mythology, 92, 132, 134, 225-233, 238
- Mythopoesis, 93, 101, 242
- Narcists, intellectual, 45, 48,
  - 123
- Nation, 35, 38, 74, 162
- Nature, human, 155, 156
- Needs, 112
- Neuroses, 31, 143
- Nirvana, 23
- Nobility, 12, 72
- Objectivity, 172, 174, 185
- Ordeal, the, 97, 98
- Order, maintenance of, 113
- Paranoia, collective, 12, 15,
  - 35-39, 85, 167, 169, 186,
  - 188, 193, 206, 209, 214
- individual, 12, 31, 32, 35,
  - 37, 39, 50, 79, 105, 215
- Parties, political, 35, 38, 177,
  - 203-209

## *Index of Subjects*

- Patriotism, 41, 55, 58, 109, 123  
     sex, 123-138  
 Persecution, 31, 55  
 Persistence, 70  
 Phantasy, cosmic, 34, 36, 131, 132, 136, 137  
     masculine, 132  
     feminine, 132, 133  
 Philosophers, 29, 46, 78, 81, 84, 131, 167, 168, 173, 174, 178, 188, 190, 191  
 Police, 161  
 Politicians, 168, 169  
 Politics, 24, 64, 65  
 Poverty, 134  
 Power, 12, 20, 21, 32, 33, 37, 38, 42, 43, 50, 56, 67, 74, 84, 87, 90, 91, 92, 101-107, 112, 113, 126, 128, 131, 137, 160, 171, 190, 205, 206, 242  
 Prejudice, unconscious, 124  
 Profit, 42, 96, 109, 160  
 Progress, 156, 193, 214  
 Propaganda, 33, 51, 176  
 Property, 77  
 Pseudo-sociology, 134, 135  
 Psychoses, 31, 32  
 Psychotics, 31  
  
 Race, 35, 38, 128  
 Rakshasas, the, 231  
 Ratiocination, 184  
 Rationality, 26, 44, 51, 52, 57, 86, 92, 93, 182, 205, 209, 212, 216  
 Rationalization, 58, 94, 95, 98, 120, 131, 190  
 Reality, 48, 68, 94, 168, 170  
 Referendum, 201  
 Reflection, 68, 94, 176  
 Relativism, sociological, 111  
 Religion, 35, 127, 128  
 Revolution, industrial, 95, 96, 97  
 Rulers, 35-39, 60, 64, 67-70, 74, 84, 89, 90, 92, 110, 117, 126, 133, 144, 188  
  
 Sadism, 40, 107, 138-141, 148, 220, 235  
 Sado-masochism, 220  
 Science, social, 92, 178  
 Scientists, 29, 46, 78, 81, 82, 84, 93, 131, 167, 168, 177, 178, 188, 190, 196, 198  
 Self-castration, 53, 224, 232  
 Sense, common, 179, 180, 185, 186, 189,  
 Sentiment, 213, 214, 215  
 Sex, 35, 38, 39, 40, 51, 52, 53, 124, 127, 136, 137, 240, 243  
 Sexuality, attitude toward, 24  
 Sincerity, 33, 104  
 Slaves, 76, 79, 120, 121, 122  
 Slums, 97  
 Socialization, 160  
 Society, failure of, 18  
     structure of, 11, 19, 28

## *Index of Subjects*

- State, the, 89  
Statesmanship, 173, 192  
Success, 154  
Suggestibility, 42  
Suicide, 71  
Superiority, 12, 31, 32, 35,  
    38, 64, 65, 67, 69, 72,  
    125, 126, 129, 135, 145,  
    146, 148, 171, 179, 187,  
    188  
Sympathy, 26, 58  
  
Testimony, 98, 99  
Theatricalism, 206  
Torture, ecclesiastical, 98  
    secular, 99, 100  
Totalitarianism, 35, 137, 210  
Traditions, 19  
Truth, and error, 33, 34, 45,  
    46, 47, 180, 199  
  
Tyranny, 59, 60, 152, 163  
  
Underworld, 64, 65, 78  
Unity, 121, 142, 143, 144,  
    166  
Use, 89  
  
Valkyries, the, 227, 230, 233  
Value, ethical, 80, 81, 117,  
    161  
  
Wages, 96  
War, 24, 64, 65, 108, 109, 110,  
    134, 145, 155, 161, 175  
Wealth, 12, 38, 43, 56, 74,  
    87, 91, 92, 112, 160  
Will, strength of, 20, 21, 26,  
    70, 71, 81, 84, 141, 142,  
    171  
  
Zeal, 33, 104





## Date Due

All library items are subject to recall 3 weeks from  
the original date stamped.


Brigham Young University

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY



**3 1197 21046 5701**

